DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 028 SO 010 256

AUTHOR	Superka, Douglas P.
TITLE	An Exploration of Social Studies Innovation in Secondary Schools.
INSTITUTION	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder, Colo.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	77
GRANT	SED-67-00222-A14
NOTE	150p.; Appendix containing data on gathering information, profiles of social studies departments and high schools, and tables of innovativeness is available under separate cover
AVAILABLE FROM	Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 855 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302 ($5.50, order SSEC Publication Number 213A; Index is $16.50, order SSEC Publication Number 213B)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; Data Analysis; Decision Making; Department Directors (School); Departments; Educational Alternatives; Educational Development; *Educational Innovation; *Educational Practice; *Educational Research; Evaluation; Instructional Improvement; Intellectual Disciplines; Secondary Education; *Social Studies; Student Participation; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Participation

ABSTRACT

The research examined innovativeness among high school social studies teachers and departments. Innovativeness is interpreted to include awareness and use of certain innovative practices (e.g., inquiry, values clarification, and community-based activities) and the "new social studies" materials, teacher participation in school decision-making processes, and involvement of students in classroom decisions. It was hypothesized that researchers could identify the effect of specific factors on social studies innovation. Four sets of variables were considered: (1) individual teacher characteristics, such as age, teaching experience, tenure, and involvement in professional organizations; (2) social studies department characteristics, such as the chairperson's leadership style, the nature and frequency of department meetings, and degree of communication and cooperation among the teachers; (3) school characteristics such as size, faculty age and experience, and provision for alternative programs; and (4) school district factors, such as size, wealth, geographic location, and political climate. Data were gathered from four sources: a survey of social studies teachers, principals, and district supervisors at 10 high schools in five districts; school observation and interviews with teachers and students; census data; and a 1969 study of political climate in schools by Harmon Ziegler and Karl Johnson. Findings indicated that the two major indicators of innovation were awareness of new project materials and use of innovative phactices. The variables which were identified as having the strongest relationships with these indicators included tenure, current position, academic degree, professional memberships, and number of college courses relating to social studies teaching. (Author/DB)

ED150028

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN EXPLORATION OF SOCIAL STUDIES INNOVATION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

Douglas P. Superka

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

SSEC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Douglas P. Superka is Staff Associate of the Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.

SO 010 256

Social Science Education Consortium
Boulder, Colorado
1977

This report was prepared with the support of the National Science Foundation Grant No. SED 67-00222-A14. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NSF.

ORDERING INFORMATION

The appendices listed in the Table of Contents and referred to in the body of the report are available separately. Order Publication No. 213B.

This publication is available from:

Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
855 Broadway
Boulder, Colorado 80302
(ORDER PUBLICATION NO. 213A)

It is also listed in *Resources in Education* and can be obtained in microfiche and hard copy from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, identified as SO 010 256. See *Resources in Education* for ordering information and ED number.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many organizations and individuals made important contributions to this research study. First, we wish to thank the National Science Foundation which provided the financial support for the project. Second, we would like to thank the teachers and administrators from the participating school districts who completed our lengthy questionnaires and allowed us to observe and interview them in their schools. Third, the following panel of social scientists and educators assisted in guiding and conducting the project, as described in "Purposes and Procedures" in Chapter I:

John R. Bare, Professor of Psychology, Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota

Richard H. Brown, Director, Committee on the Study of History, The Newberry Library, Chicago, Illinois

J. Ross Eshelman, Chairman, Department of Sociology, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Geneva Gay, Associate Secretary, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), Washington, D.C.

Peter Senn, Professor of Economics, Wilbur Wright College, Chicago, Illinois

George Vuicich, Professor of Geography, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan

James B. Watson, Professor of Anthropology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

Harmon Zeigler, Professor of Political Science, Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon

We appreciate the efforts of all these individuals, especially Dick Brown, Peter Senn, and Ross Eshelman, who critically reviewed several drafts of this report. In addition to their work as research consultants, each of the following panel members wrote a high school profile:

Richard H. Brown	Lighthouse High School
J. Ross Eshelman	Rios High School
Geneva Gay	Clouds Senior High School
George Vuicich	Hunter High School
James B. Watson	Stephen A. Douglas High School

The following school profiles were written by SSEC staff members and an educational consultant:

Bonny M. Cochran	Riverside High School
Bette J. Haas	Raintree High School
Sr. Georgianna Simon	Williams High School
Douglas P. Superka	Flint High School

Four of these nine school profiles are found in Chapter III of this report. The others are in Appendix B.

Several other SSEC professional staff members were very helpful during various aspects of this project. They are: Irving Morrissett, Frances Haley, and Janet Jacobs. Secretarial staff who provided accurate and dependable work were Linda Branch, Lisa Cole, Celeste Fraser, and Cindy Ellis.

Finally, Gerald W. Marker of Indiana University reviewed this report and made a number of excellent suggestions for improving it.

While we are indebted to all these individuals and organizations for their help, SSEC is responsible for whatever limitations and weaknesses remain in the report.

Douglas P. Superka

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements. i

Table of Contents iii

Abstract. 1

CHAPTER ONE

AN EXPLORATION OF SOCIAL STUDIES INNOVATION. 3
Social Studies in the Classroom: Three Examples 3
Project Objectives. 5
Review of Research Literature on Innovation 6
Background and Definitions 7
Noneducational Studies 11
Education Studies. 18
Conclusion 24
Purposes and Procedures of this Study 25
SSEC Staff and the Research Team 25
Key Questions. 26
Sampling Design and Data-gathering Procedures. . . . 27
The Data--Description, Analysis, and Use 32

CHAPTER TWO

TEACHER INNOVATIVENESS 39
Representativeness of the Sample. 39
The Four Main Indices of Innovation 41
Awareness of Social Studies Projects 41
Use of Innovative Practices. 42
Participation by Teachers in Decision Making 43
Involvement of Students in Classroom 44
Interrelationship Among the Four Indices of Innovation. . 45
Teacher Awareness and Innovative Practices 45
Teacher Awareness and Student Involvement. 46
Teacher Awareness and Participation in Decision Making 46
Innovative Practices and Student Involvement 46
Innovative Practices and Teacher Participation in Decision Making 47
Student Involvement and Teacher Participation in Decision Making 47
Summary and Discussion 47
Awareness of Social Studies Project Materials 50
Teacher Use of Innovative Practices 53
Teacher Participation in School Decision Making 55
Student Involvement in Classroom Decision Making. 58
Summary 60

CHAPTER THREE

SOCIAL STUDIES DEPARTMENT AND SCHOOL INNOVATIVENESS. 63
Innovation in Two Small Rural High Schools. 63
A Profile of Williams Senior High School 63
A Profile of Flint High School 71
A Comparison of Williams and Flint 82
Innovation in Two Large Suburban High Schools 88
A Profile of Stephen A. Douglas High School. 89
A Profile of Clouds Senior High School 103
A Comparison of Stephen A. Douglas and Clouds. . . .114
Conclusion. 121

CHAPTER FOUR

DISTRICT INNOVATIVENESS. 125
A Comparison of Opal and Diamond County School Districts 125

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. 135

References. 141

*APPENDICES

Appendix A - Data Gathering Instruments. 1
Questionnaire for Social Studies Teachers 2
Questionnaire for High School Principals. 22
Questionnaire for Superintendent. 29
Phone Survey Form 35
Interview Schedule: Social Studies Teachers. 36
Interview Schedule: Department Chairperson 39
Interview Schedule: Principal. 43

Appendix B - Social Studies Department and High School Profiles. 47
Schedule of School Visits 48
SSEC Innovation Case Study: Riverside High School (Opal County). 49
SSEC Innovation Case Study: Raintree High School (Opal County). 59
SSEC Innovation Case Study: Rios High School (Opal County) 74
SSEC Innovation Case Study: Lighthouse High School (Diamond County) 86
SSEC Innovation Case Study: Hunter High School (Diamond County) 97

*The appendices mentioned in this report can be ordered separately from SSEC, Publication No. 213B. (See ordering information inside title page.)

Appendix C - Tables of Results: Teacher Innovativeness . . .109
Results of the Teacher Sample on Thirty-One Variables. 110
Variable Label, Descriptions and Keys. 118
Awareness and Use of the Social Studies Project Materials. 128
Cross-Tabulation Tables: Awareness of Project Materials. 132
Cross-Tabulation Tables: Use of Innovative Practices. 163
Cross-Tabulation Tables: Teacher Participation in Decision Making 194
Cross-Tabulation Tables: Student Involvement in Classroom Decisions. 225

Appendix D - Tables of Results: Social Studies Department and High School Innovativeness 257
Social Studies Department Mean Scores on the Four Indicators of Innovation for the Nine High Schools Visited. 258
Frequency Distribution: Flint 261
Frequency Distribution: Williams. 279
Frequency Distribution: Raintree. 297
Frequency Distribution: Riverside 316
Frequency Distribution: Rios. 336
Frequency Distribution: Lighthouse. 354
Frequency Distribution: Stephen A. Douglas. 374
Frequency Distribution: Clouds. 394
Frequency Distribution: Hunter. 414

Appendix E - Tables of Results: School District Innovativeness 435
Condescriptive Data: Opal County. 436
Condescriptive Data: Diamond County 449

Abstract

This study examined factors that related to innovativeness and noninnovativeness among social studies teachers, departments, and school districts.

Ten schools in five districts were chosen to participate in this innovation study, some of which were classified as innovative and others as noninnovative. Social studies teachers at these schools, along with principals and district supervisors, completed questionnaires identifying characteristics of their social studies and general high school programs. Follow-up site visits and interviews were conducted by Social Science Education Consortium representatives in May 1975.

Four main indicators of innovativeness were considered: (1) awareness of social studies project materials, (2) use of various innovative practices, (3) participation in school decision-making processes, and (4) involvement of students in classroom decisions.

Data were gathered to determine the nature and extent of innovativeness and the degree to which certain variables seemed related to teacher, department, and district innovativeness. These data included: questionnaire results of social studies teachers, school principals, and district supervisors; school observation data; previously gathered census data; and political climate information from a previous study by Ziegler and Johnson (1969).

It was impossible to distinguish innovative and noninnovative districts by the use of data gathered in this study; therefore, the innovativeness or noninnovativeness of teachers and departments was the primary focus of the study results.

A relationship was revealed between the statistical indicators and the observations of the site visitors in terms of identifying the most and least innovative departments. Awareness of the project materials and use of certain innovative practices were found to be the major indicators of innovation.

Several variables were identified as having strong relationships with the two major indicators of innovation. Tenure, current position, and highest academic degree appeared to be related to teacher awareness of the social studies project materials. Chairpersons, tenured teachers, and teachers with master's degrees or beyond were more likely to be aware of those materials. Number of professional memberships and college courses related to teaching social studies were related most strongly with teacher use of various innovative practices.

Chapter One

An Exploration of Social Studies Innovation

Social Studies in the Classroom: Three Examples

Example One

Ms. Christopher, a young American history teacher, is sitting on her desk, giving an informal lecture on the causes of the First World War to her 11th-grade class of 23 students. The students are sitting in their desks, which are arranged in five six-desk rows, facing the teacher. Their textbooks, *Rise of the American Nation* by Todd and Curti, are opened to Chapter 32. A few maps are on the bulletin board in addition to several *New York Times* front page reprints (e.g., "Lusitania Sinks!," "Wilson Asks Congress to Declare War"). A few key words are on the chalkboard: Serbia, Central Powers, Edith Cavell. Two students are looking at the teacher. The rest are reading the school newspaper or novels, pretending to take notes, or sleeping. Finally, noticing the lack of attention, Ms. Christopher said, "Well no one seems interested in listening to me. Dale, why don't you come up here and give your report on the Second Battle of the Marne." Dale proceeded to read his report while the teacher took a turn at reading the school newspaper.

Example Two

The social studies sector of this huge, new, circular-shaped, open-space high school is bright, colorful, and air conditioned. The floor is carpeted; the walls are adorned with student-painted murals, posters, charts, and collages. A sculptured bust of Richard Nixon prominently sits on top of a large book case. Each of two large-group instruction areas is equipped with 125 movable student desks, arranged in a concentric semicircle, facing a metal lecturn with a microphone. The room also contains four TV monitors, a large screen, overhead projectors, and several tape recorders. A team-taught American studies class is in progress. Mr. Osborn, the 40-year-old department chairperson, stands

at the lecturn, microphone in hand, introducing the day's lesson while his two team members are in the back of the room, taking roll. The students are preparing to watch a film (on the TV monitors) about the rise of Mao Tse Tung. Mr. Osborn says that, since most students didn't seem to pay attention to or remember the key elements of the last several films, he is going to give them some questions to answer. The overhead projector is turned on and ten focus questions appear on the large movie screen. The first three are: "Who was Mao's hero in history?," "What country invaded China in 1931?," and "Who said, 'China is a Sleeping Giant'?" The students watch the film and write answers to the questions when they hear them. Often, they consult neighbors. After the film, Mr. Osborn leads a question-and-answer review session.

Example Three

"Coors!" "Guys!" "Friends!" Three students are writing words about things they value on sheets of poster paper that contain outlines of their heads. In a far corner of the room, another group of students is watching a filmstrip from the Kohlberg-Fenton *Values in a Democracy* series entitled, "Legal Issues: What's Right?" Ron Parker, the 32-year-old teacher, is in another corner of the room talking with several students about developing plans for their next learning unit. Three other students are collating and stapling forms for use at a neighboring high school, where they will observe and interview teachers and students about the school's decision-making structure. Several other students are casually sitting on the sofa and chairs reading novels. One student is staring out of a huge window of this old red brick schoolhouse--gazing across the field and pond to the majestic mountains in the background. This is one of four rooms on the first floor of the old elementary school, now converted into an alternative high school. Except for a teacher's desk in one corner of the room, where one student is writing, there are no student desks. Besides the sofa, the room is furnished with several long tables, a card table, folding chairs, bookshelves, and many plants. While one group of students is writing plans for the next unit, Ron goes over to the filmstrip group

and helps them discuss the pertinent issues. The following questions are heatedly discussed: "What might happen if Frank reported the car accident?," "What might happen if he did not report it?," "What should the boy do?," "Why?," "Is it more important to obey the law or help his friend?," "Why?," and "Have you ever been involved in a similar conflict?"

Project Objectives

The foregoing three scenes illustrate the types of activities occurring in social studies classrooms across the country. The first and second cases are probably most prevalent: teacher-directed, lecture-discussion, traditional textbooks, focus on facts, little student involvement, and little change over the years.

However, various forms of the third situation also exist: student-centered, discussion and activities, new materials, focus on concepts, much student involvement, and planned changes.

Why are some social studies teachers and departments, high schools, and school districts like the former (noninnovative), while others are like the latter (innovative)? Is it due to their geographic locations? The teachers' education? The principal? The wealth of the district? The physical setting of the school? This study attempts to answer these and related questions.

Previous research on educational innovation is extensive. Many studies have attempted, directly or indirectly, to identify the key factors that aid and hinder educational innovation. Few, however, have focused on social studies innovation. Moreover, a bewildering variety of operational definitions and research designs have been used in educational innovation research. The results, often contradictory and conflicting, have confused the issues and raised more questions than they have answered.

Although this study does not pretend to provide definitive answers to all these questions, it does hope to clarify some of the confusion--especially that related to secondary social studies teacher innovativeness. It is further hoped that the research project results will be of

practical use to curriculum developers and disseminators and to school people. Such results should help educational developers and disseminators find teachers, departments, schools, and districts that are more inclined to examine, experiment with, and implement innovative ideas. Rather than dealing with all secondary schools or teachers, developers and disseminators can focus on those with certain characteristics (e.g., teachers of a particular age, academic major, or years of training experience) related to social studies innovation. School superintendent, principals, and department chairpersons can find clues about the kinds of teachers who are most likely to create an innovative atmosphere--ones who initiate and respond to changes and new ideas. Also, these educators can identify factors in their systems that must be changed to facilitate social studies innovation.

Finally, the investigators hope this study will stimulate further efforts to clarify factors that either foster or inhibit change and innovation. The long-term results of such research could improve one of the most neglected areas in the curriculum reform movement--the dissemination and implementation of new social studies curricula and instructional techniques.

Review of Research Literature on Innovation

This review of literature is divided into four parts. The first part, Background and Definitions, provides a general overview of innovation research and defines key terms. The second section, Non-educational Studies, discusses the conclusions and findings of innovation research in areas such as rural sociology and medicine as well as on various psychological and sociological variables related to innovation adoption. These first two parts draw heavily from a previous review of diffusion literature by Jwaideh and Marker (1973). In the third section, Educational Studies, investigations focusing on educational innovation are reviewed. These studies are discussed in two groups. The first includes studies that concentrate on a particular educational innovation (e.g., instructional television and open-space

schools) or that reflect a particular methodological orientation (e.g., historical and sociological). The second group of studies attempts to determine factors, especially in a school system, that have a significant relationship to educational innovation. This section is partially based on a recent review of the literature by Dick (1974). In the Conclusion, the significance of the current innovation project is discussed in light of previous research.

Background and Definitions

Innovation, or planned change through the dissemination and utilization of knowledge, is an extensively researched topic. Havelock (1971) cites nearly 4,000 studies of knowledge dissemination and utilization--many directly related to innovation. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) have gathered a list of over 1,500 "diffusion of innovation" citations. Most of these studies are in the fields of education, agriculture, and communication, and most are quantitative experimental studies (53 percent) rather than theoretical (25 percent) or case studies (seven percent).

Despite the diversity of studies on innovation and the diffusion/dissemination process, there is not as much confusion or conflict over the meanings of central terms as might be expected. Rogers has been largely responsible for this terminological clarity and agreement. Jwaideh and Marker (1973, pp. 21-26) describe his impact and clearly and concisely explain his definition of terms:

> Everett M. Rogers, more than any other writer, has attempted to synthesize these diverse publications and to develop standardized terminology for dealing with the diffusion process. Thus, *Diffusion of Innovations* (Rogers 1962) and the second edition of that book, a synthesis of more than 1,500 publications in all fields dealing with the communication of innovations entitled, *Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach* (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971), provide the framework for the definitions given in this section.
>
> *Diffusion* is the process by which innovations spread to the members of a social system. In other words, diffusion is the spread of a new idea from its source to its ultimate users. The diffusion process involves four elements: (1) the *innovation*, (2) its *communication* through certain *channels*, (3) over *time*, (4) among the members of a *social system*.

An *innovation* is an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new by an individual. An innovation may have two components: an idea component and an object component (the material or physical aspect of the idea). All innovations have an ideational component, but some do not have a physical referent. The term "innovation" does not always refer to *new* knowledge. An individual might be aware of an innovation for some time but may not have developed a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward it. By "new," it is meant that an innovation has not been functionally adopted or incorporated by the individual or social system. In some cases, an innovation may be an adaptation or improvement rather than something entirely new or unique.

Communication refers to the process by which messages are transferred from a source to a receiver, usually with the intention of modifying the receiver's behavior. It will be seen that the diffusion process corresponds closely to the well-known S-M-C-R-E communication model, consisting of *source, message, channel, receivers*, and *effects*. The source is the origin of the innovation (inventor, scientist, developer, opinion leader); the message is a new idea; the channel is the means by which the innovation spreads; the receivers are the members of the social system; and the effects are the changes in knowledge, attitudes, and overt behavior (adoption or rejection) regarding the innovation. It is obvious that the nature of the relationship between the source and the receiver--that is, between the diffuser and the potential adopter--is extremely important since this relationship influences the circumstances under which a message will be conveyed, the manner in which it will be transmitted, and the effects upon the receiver.

The *communication channels*, or means by which a message gets from a source to a receiver, are also important. If the source simply wishes to inform the receiver about an innovation, *mass-media channels* are often the most rapid and efficient, especially if the audience is large. On the other hand, if the source's objective is to *persuade* the receiver--that is, to induce him to form a favorable attitude toward the innovation or to try it--then *interpersonal channels* are usually more effective.

The *time* dimension, a very important element in diffusion, is involved (1) in the decision-making process through which an individual or group determines whether to adopt or reject an innovation, (2) the rate of adoption of an innovation within a social system, and (3) in the relative innovativeness of an individual as compared with other members of his social system.

The *innovation-decision process* is the mental process through which an individual passes from first knowledge of an innovation to a decision to adopt or reject it. Although Rogers and Shoemaker (1971, p. 25) now conceptualize four main steps in this process (knowledge, persuasion or attitude formation, decision, and

confirmation), the innovation-decision process discussed in Rogers' earlier work (1962, pp. 81-86) postulated five steps: (1) *awareness*, or first knowledge of an innovation; (2) *interest*, or gaining further knowledge about the innovation; (3) *evaluation*, or forming a favorable or unfavorable attitude; (4) *trial* of the innovation, on either a temporary or partial basis; and (5) *adoption*, which is a decision to make full use of an innovation as the best course of action available, or *rejection*, which is a decision not to adopt an innovation. A *discontinuance* is a decision to cease use of an innovation after previously having adopted it. (This can be due to dissatisfaction with the innovation, difficulties in implementing it, or replacement of the innovation with something else.)

The *rate of adoption*, the relative speed with which an innovation is adopted by members of a social system, is usually measured by the length of time required for a certain percentage of the members to adopt. Note that it is the system, not the individual, that is the unit of analysis. . . .

Innovativeness is the degree to which an individual is earlier in adopting an innovation than other members of his social system. Obviously, all individuals do not adopt an innovation at the same time. Diffusion research has found that, in most cases, frequency distributions based upon time of adoption of an innovation closely approximate a normal or bell-shaped curve, or, plotted cumulatively, an S-shaped curve. (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 177)

To facilitate comparisons, Rogers and Shoemaker have defined five adopter categories based upon normal distribution and formed by laying off standard deviations from the average time of adoption: (1) *innovators*, the first 2.5 percent to adopt; (2) *early adopters*, the next 13.5 percent to adopt; (3) *early majority*, the next 34 percent to adopt; (4) *late majority*, the next 34 percent to adopt; and (5) *laggards*, the last 16 percent to adopt. (Bogus and Shoemaker 1971, pp. 176-191)

The *social system* is a collectivity of units that are functionally differentiated and that cooperate toward the solution of a common problem or the achievement of a common goal. The units of a social system may be individuals, formal or informal groups of various sizes, or complex organizations such as schools. The characteristics of the social system within which diffusion occurs may affect the rate and pattern of diffusion in a number of ways.

A system's social structure--including its norms, social statuses, and hierarchy--has certain effects on the behavior of individual members. These "system effects" can exert a powerful influence on the individual and can impede or facilitate the rate at which new ideas are diffused and adopted. Some studies suggest that the nature of the social system often has a more important influence on an individual's behavior than do personal characteristics such as personality, attitudes, education, and communication patterns.

Also, innovations can have the effect of changing or restructuring the social system. However, it should be kept in mind that individuals of highest status and power in a system, the elite, can serve as "gatekeepers" in controlling the flow of innovations into the system from outside sources. The gatekeepers often prevent the introduction of restructuring innovations and prefer those that will not disturb the status quo of the system's structure.

Norms, the established patterns of behavior for members of a social system, define the range of permissible behavior and serve as a standard for the individual members. Sociologists have distinguished two types of norms that are closely related to a social system's tendency to be either receptive or resistant to change: traditional norms and modern norms. Persons in social systems with modern norms tend to adopt new ideas more rapidly and to view change more favorably than persons in systems with traditional norms.

Opinion leaders are persons who are able to influence informally the attitudes or overt behaviors of other members of a social system. These leaders often provide information and advice about innovations to many other members. Opinion leadership is a type of informal leadership that is not necessarily related to a person's formal status in the system, although formal leaders may in some cases function also as opinion leaders.

Opinion leaders may hold a leadership role on the basis of their expertise or technical competence, their social accessibility, and their conformity to the norms of their system. Because of these characteristics, they often serve as models for the behavior of their followers with regard to innovations. The opinion leaders in a modern social system tend to be innovative, whereas the opinion leaders in a traditional social system are often non-innovative. . . .

Another important characteristic of social systems is the way in which innovation decisions are typically made. Within a given system, three major kinds of innovation decisions may be made. Rogers and Shoemaker call these three types of innovation decisions *optional decisions*, *collective decisions*, and *authority decisions* (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, pp. 36-38). Optional

> decisions are made by an individual independently of decisions made by other members of the social system. Collective decisions are made by members of the social system by consensus. Authority decisions are imposed upon the individual by someone in a superordinate power position. A *contingent decision* is one that can be made only after a prior innovation decision has been made by the system.

Noneducational Studies

Considerable innovation research has been conducted outside the education field. Most of this work has emanated from anthropology, sociology, medicine, communication, marketing, and public health. Other disciplines producing research on diffusion of innovations include general economics, agricultural economics, geography, psychology, and linguistics. (Jwaideh and Marker 1973, p. 26) These studies contain some significant implications for the diffusion and innovation process and, hence, are relevant to educational innovation. Some researchers in these other fields have even discussed implications of research in education. For instance, Rogers (1973) enumerated implications in the following areas: attributes of innovations, change agent credibility, product characteristics, characteristics of the school system, and communication channels.

Jwaideh and Marker (1973, pp. 26-27) have summarized and criticized the research of noneducation innovations:

> Most research on diffusion of innovations has dealt with (1) the characteristics of adopted categories, particularly the correlates of innovativeness (sociology, education, medicine, and marketing); (2) the S-shaped distribution of adoption over time, or the diffusion curve (sociology, rural sociology, and education); (3) the perceived attributes of innovations as related to their rate of adoption (rural sociology); (4) opinion leadership in the diffusion process (rural sociology, medical sociology, communication, and marketing); (5) communication channels in the adoption process (rural sociology, medical sociology, and communication); (6) the diffusion of ideas from one society to another, the social consequences of technological innovations, and the relative success of change agents (anthroplogy); and (7) correlates of innovativeness among industrial firms (industrial economics). . . .

The chief limitation of diffusion research is the almost exclusive focus of most studies on the individual as the unit of adoption and the minimal attention paid to the role played by relationships among

individuals and by organizational factors in the change process. Diffusion research has concentrated almost entirely on "optional" (individual) innovation decisions and has generally neglected collective and authoritative decisions. Also, there has been much more research emphasis on the diffusion of innovations from the physical and biological sciences than from the social sciences. This study is an exception to the "rule."

Individual Variables. Individual variables, as stated above, have received the most attention. Researchers have concentrated heavily on three types of individual variables: socioeconomic characteristics, communication behavior, and cognitive characteristics and attitudes. Jwaideh and Marker (1973, pp. 29-30) summarized the findings of these three types of variables:

> In terms of *socioeconomic characteristics*, earlier adopters are no different from later adopters age-wise, but earlier adopters generally have more years of education, higher social status, greater wealth, a higher level of aspiration and achievement motivation, and a greater degree of upward social mobility than later adopters.
>
> With regard to *communication behavior*, earlier adopters are more "cosmopolite" (i.e., their reference groups are more likely to be outside rather than within their social system); travel more widely; have more contacts with change agents, and have greater exposure to both mass media and interpersonal communication channels than later adopters. Earlier adopters also have greater knowledge of innovations and are more inclined to seek information about them; have a higher degree of opinion leadership; and are more likely to belong to well-integrated social systems with modern norms. In contrast, later adopters tend to be more "localite" (i.e., their reference groups are more likely to be within their social system); travel less; have fewer contacts with change agents; and have less exposure to communication channels--especially mass media.
>
> In terms of *cognitive and attitudinal variables*, research indicates that earlier adopters have greater empathy than later adopters; have greater intelligence, rationality, and ability to deal with abstractions; and have more favorable attitudes toward change, risk, education, and science. They are less fatalistic than later adopters and have higher levels of achievement motivation. A comprehensive list of specific studies supporting each of these findings is provided by Rogers and Shoemaker. (1971, pp. 352-76)

While the findings discussed above are derived directly from innovation research, information on the psychological variables of individual innovativeness has not come directly from this research. Rather, it has developed mainly from social-psychological laboratory research dealing with "basic personality characteristics related to acceptance or rejection of new ideas" (Jwaideh and Marker 1973, p. 31). Guskin's chapter on "The Individual" in Havelock (1971) contains a good review of the individual variables related to innovativeness, with references to specific studies. The following list of conclusions drawn from this research is based on the Jwaideh and Marker analysis (1973, pp. 32-41):

Self-Esteem

1) Persons with high self-esteem and self-confidence are more likely to react independently, take some risks, and, thus, be more open to innovations.

2) Persons with low self-esteem, when left alone, tend to resist change.

3) Persons with low self-esteem, belonging to a group that adopts an innovation, tend to adopt it also to gain group approval. If the group rejects it, he or she does also.

Authoritarianism and Dogmatism

1) Persons lower in dogmatism and authoritarianism tend to be more receptive to innovations.

2) Persons high in dogmatism and authoritarianism tend to accept innovations proposed by persons in positions of power and authority.

Values

1) Innovations perceived by the individual as related to higher values are accepted.

2) Innovations perceived by the individual as counter to his or her values are rejected.

Needs

1) Innovations relevant to and effective in fulfilling important, salient needs tend to be accepted.

2) Innovations that do not fit one's needs tend to be rejected.

3) If the person does not perceive a conflict between innovation and his or her needs (or values), the innovation may be adopted.

4) If person has lower-level needs that have been aroused and are unsatisfied, but an innovation fits a higher-order need, the person will tend to reject innovation.

5) Persons high in achievement motivation are more inclined to innovate (take reasonable risks) than persons low in achievement motivation.

6) Persons high in need for affiliation tend to overemphasize being successful and getting along with others and, therefore, do not take the risks involved in adopting innovations.

7) Highly dependent persons could tend to adopt innovations if leadership was exerted by a forceful change agent.

8) Active copers (they try to change the environment) are more likely to be innovative than passive copers (they try to conform to the environment).

9) Persons who have had successful experience with a previous innovation are more likely to adopt a new innovation than persons who have experienced failure with previous innovations.

10) Persons experiencing extreme cognitive dissonance when confronted with a new innovation and persons experiencing no dissonance are not likely to adopt that innovation.

Interpersonal Variables. In addition to the individual variables outlined above, interpersonal factors operating between the potential adopters and the innovators are involved in determining the success or failure of a given change effort. The following are conclusions drawn from social science research on change and discussed by Jwaideh and Marker (1973, pp. 41-45):

1) The greater the similarity between the change agent and the potential adopter, the greater the likelihood of the latter adopting the innovation.

2) The more the potential adopter likes the innovator, the more likely the innovation will be adopted.

3) The more credible (competent, trustworthy) a change agent is perceived to be, the more effective he or she will be.

4) If the change agent's role is accepted as legitimate by the potential adopter, the latter will be more predisposed to accept information related to the former's skills as accurate and reliable, and, therefore, will be more likely to adopt the innovation.

5) Past experience with a change agent, like past experience with innovation, is a significant factor in the innovation process.

Seven factors related to the change agent have been identified by Rogers and Shoemaker (1971, pp. 247-48, 380-82) as significant to the innovation process. They are summarized by Jwaideh and Marker (1973, p. 44). A change agent's success is positively related to (1) the extent of his efforts--that is, the amount of activity in which he engages and the number of contacts he makes with potential adopters; (2) the degree to which he is client-oriented rather than change-agency oriented; (3) the degree to which his program is compatible with clients' needs; (4) his homophily (perceived similarity) with clients; (5) the extent to which he works through opinion leaders; (6) his credibility in the clients' eyes; and (7) his efforts to increase the clients' ability to evaluate innovations.

Organization and Social System Variables. Another set of factors influencing the degree a person accepts or chooses an innovation involves the relationship between the individual and the group or organization to which he or she belongs. Some of the key group variables that might influence an individual's willingness to adopt an innovation are discussed by Jwaideh and Marker (1973, pp. 46-47):

> Participation. Research has found that participation with others in decision making usually leads to commitment to the group's actions. Much of this research has been done in studies of participation in industrial organizations, but studies in group dynamics and community decision making also support this principle.
>
> Cohesiveness. The greater the closeness of ties among members of a group, the greater will be the agreement between them in terms of attitudes toward innovations.
>
> Conformity and social support. The closer a group is to unanimity on an issue, the greater the resistance will be to an action contrary to the norm. Individuals who are highly accepted by the group are more likely to deviate from group norms; individuals who are insecure about their positions in the group will tend to follow the group's norms.
>
> Social integration. Persons who are socially integrated are more likely to adopt innovations than social isolates. People are most likely to adopt an innovation through social interaction with persons who use or know about the innovation.

Status. Personal social influence seems to operate mainly with persons of the same status under most circumstances. An exception is that persons tend to look to people of higher status for information and advice if such is needed and if status differences do not produce anxiety or tension. However, persons of lower status tend to resist influence if they perceive that the person of higher status is attempting to influence them.

Another set of variables related to innovation is the particular characteristics of the larger social system to which the individual belongs. These variables are also discussed by Jwaideh and Marker (1973, pp. 47-51):

> Considerable research has been conducted to determine how social systems that are receptive to change differ from those that are resistant to change. Much of this research has focused on the differences between social systems having so-called "traditional" norms and those having "modern" norms.
>
> *Traditional social systems* are characterized by (1) lack of favorable orientation to change; (2) a less developed or simpler technology; (3) relatively low levels of literacy, education, and understanding of the scientific method; (4) social enforcement of the status quo, facilitated by affective personal relationships (e.g., hospitality, friendship) that are highly valued as ends in themselves; (5) little communication with person outside a given system; and (6) inability to "empathize." (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 32)
>
> *Modern* social systems are characterized by (1) a generally positive attitude toward change; (2) well-developed technology with a complex division of labor; (3) a high value on education and science; (4) social relationships that are rational and business-like rather than emotional and affective; (5) frequent contact with persons outside the system, facilitating the entrance of new ideas into the system; and (6) empathy on the part of the members. (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, pp. 32-33)
>
> It should be kept in mind that these two clusters of norms represent end-points on a continuum and that most social systems fall somewhere between these two extremes. Also, an individual may belong to two or more social systems having greatly different norms, and this may produce conflict in the individual. For example, an innovative teacher who has just completed training at a university where innovations were constantly discussed is likely to experience conflict if he wants to introduce these innovations into a traditional school system.

Characteristics of Innovative Organizations

A basic element in organizational theory is that of organizational health. A "healthy" organization is an open system that is relatively susceptible to change and that takes care of innovations as an adaptive response. Further, the healthy organization is continually growing in its ability not only to function effectively but to develop and extend its capacity for coping creatively with its environment.

Miles maintains that the state of health of an organization, including an educational organization, can tell us more than anything else about the probable success of any particular change effort. He suggests that organizational health consists of ten dimensions, which are based partly upon behavioral research findings and partly upon his extensive experience with school systems.

Goal focus. The goals of the organization are clear, accepted by the members, achievable with existing or available resources, and appropriate to demands of the environment.

Communication adequacy. There is relatively distortion-free communication vertically, horizontally, and across the boundary of the system to and from the surrounding environment. People have the information they need or can get it without exerting efforts.

Optimal power equalization. The distribution of influence is relatively equitable, and subordinates at all levels can influence upward. Relationships are collaborative rather than coercive, and units are interdependent. Influence in a given situation depends upon competence and knowledge rather than organizational position.

Resource utilization. The system's inputs, particularly its personnel, are used effectively and are neither overloaded nor idle. There is a minimal sense of strain along with a good fit between people's dispositions and the role demands of the system, so that people feel reasonably "self-actualized"--that is, they have a genuine sense of growing and developing as persons while making their contribution to the organization.

Cohesiveness. Members of the organization feel attracted to the organization and have a sense of identity with it.

Morale. There is a sense of well being, satisfaction, and pleasure among members of the system as opposed to feelings of discomfort, strain, and dissatisfaction.

Innovativeness. A healthy organization grows, develops, and changes; it tends to invent new procedures, move toward new goals, and become more diversified over time.

Autonomy. A healthy organization does not respond passively to demands from the outside but maintains some degree of independence.

Adaptation. A healthy organization has realistic, effective contact with its surroundings. It has the ability to bring about corrective change through a problem-solving, restructuring approach.

Problem-solving adequacy. A healthy organization has well-developed structures and procedures for sensing the existence of problems, inventing possible solutions, deciding upon solutions, implementing them, and evaluating their effectiveness. (Miles 1965, pp. 11-34)

Characteristics of Leaders

Extremely important in terms of innovativeness within organizations are the characteristics of individuals in top leadership positions. The personality attributes, interests, training, and attitudes toward new techniques that characterize such persons have been found to be closely related to the degree of innovativeness of industrial firms. Research in education also indicates that the characteristics of school superintendents are important determinants of the innovativeness of school districts.

Communication Within Organizations

Frohman and Havelock who reviewed the factors that facilitate or inhibit the flow of new knowledge through organizations divide information flow into three categories: input, internal processing or throughput, and output. These authors point out that the effects of organizational characteristics on information flow depend upon resolution of two competing demands: (1) the drive to maintain order and certainty, which tends to create structures, hierarchies, requirements, and screening procedures that act as barriers to information flow, and (2) the drive to innovate and improve, which tends to remove such barriers. (Frohman and Havelock 1969)

Education Studies

The innovation process has received considerable attention from educational researchers in recent years. Their studies mainly fall into two categories. One category consists of analyses of the success or failure of a specific innovation. Usually these studies reflect a particular disciplinary approach to innovation research. The other

category contains investigations that have attempted to identify those individual and school-system variables that correlate with general educational innovativeness or innovation adoption.

Studies that examine a particular educational innovation, usually by a case study method, are most valuable as sources of hypotheses for further testing and as in-depth lessons for persons involved in similar situations. Their particular conclusions, however, are not generalizable. The most relevant aspects of this research to this study are the particular kinds of innovation considered and the methodological approaches employed, rather than their specific results.

A variety of methodological approaches have been used in these studies. Although historical accounts of particular innovations are most frequently used, other methodological approaches have been applied. Gross (1971) did a sociological case study of the implementation of the "catalytic role model" of teaching. The anthropological-clinical mode of inquiry is reflected in Smith's (1971) study of open-space instruction in four school buildings. A similar approach was employed to examine one set of related school organization innovations in four Canadian schools (King and Ripton 1970; King 1972).

The case study approaches also used by Smith and Keith (1971) compiled an in-depth analysis of the first year of an open-space school. Finally, Evans and Leppman (1967) applied social-psychological analysis in their case history of the response of the academic community of one university to instructional television. An interesting methodological aspect of this study was the investigators' attempt to gain some indication of the generalizability of their findings by comparing their conclusions with the interview results of a sample of administrators and faculty members from nine other institutions in the nation.

Another cluster of research studies on particular innovations is found in social studies education. Several of these studies examine and evaluate specific diffusion models in social studies. Marker and Mehlinger (1972), for instance, evaluated a two-year experimental program at Indiana University that removed, trained, and re-implanted

field change agents in school districts to enhance the diffusion and adoption of social studies innovations. Other models of social studies dissemination and adoption have also been studied (Myers 1969 and Center for Educational Studies, Washington University 1970). A few social studies curriculum projects have attempted to investigate and evaluate efforts to disseminate their innovative materials. Richburg (1970), for example, used open-ended questionnaires to determine how and why schools adopted the Anthropology Curriculum Project materials. This question is of central importance to this study. Richburg found several factors related to the adoption of those materials, such as the desire to improve the elementary social studies program, previous experience with adoption of other innovative social studies materials, and the existence of a change agent in the schools.

The second group of studies on educational innovation involves attempts to correlate variables related to individuals and to school systems with innovativeness or innovation adoption. These studies reflect a wide range of conceptions about what constitutes educational innovativeness. Some studies, such as Carlson (1965), Kohl (1969), and Ziegler and Johnson (1969) used the adoption of innovations, such as the "new math," flexible scheduling, team teaching, language labs, televised instruction, simulations, and games, as the criterion. Hilfiker (1970), on the other hand, used rankings on innovativeness from three sources (district superintendent, professional staff, and a panel of ten experts) as the measure of the schools' innovativeness. Studies focusing on social studies education, such as Matula (1972), usually have used the adoption of certain social studies classroom innovations as the criterion of innovativeness.

Even in those studies that use adoption as the criterion of innovation, there is little agreement as to what constitutes adoption. Is purchase of materials sufficient? Or, must the materials' actual use in the schools be demonstrated? If so, how widely throughout the system must the materials be used to constitute a state of adoption? Must materials be adapted to local conditions to be truly adopted? Another set of problems arises when one considers particular school situations. The use of a particular "innovation" or "set of

innovations" in one school may represent educational stagnation rather than innovativeness. This is especially true if studies in the seventies continue to use the innovations of the fifties and sixties as their indicators. Conversely, it is possible that certain schools are very innovative without using the "typical" educational innovations. These issues must be considered when one interprets and compares the results of the education studies outlined below. The discussion of the studies dealing with characteristics related to educational innovativeness will be organized into those focusing on school-system variables and those focusing on individual teacher variables.

School-system variables. Research to determine the characteristics of innovative schools is fairly extensive but inconclusive and contradictory. Much of this research has centered around the organizational climate of the schools. While Crandall (1971) and Miles (1964) found that open communication channels were characteristic of innovative organizations, Chesler (1966) did not. Marcum (1968), Hilfiker (1970), and Hillman (1969) found that an open organizational climate was significantly and positively related to school innovativeness, but Dick (1974) and Bamberger (1970) discovered no such relationship. Dick (1974), in fact, found that eight of the ten innovative social studies departments researched had closed climates. Gill (1969) and Miles (1964) reported opposing findings about the need for specialists within the school system to promote innovation. The degree of social support provided by principals to teachers and problem-solving abilities of staff meetings (Hilfiker 1970) have also been significantly related to the organizational climate for innovation in some, but not all, studies.

The personality characteristics of the administrators are important aspects of the organizational climate. Carlson (1965) found the following personality characteristics related to the innovativeness of the school: willingness of administrators to adopt innovative ideas, leadership style of the administrators, and the communications network in the organization. From studies of superintendents in West Virginia and Pennsylvania, Carlson distinguished two groups--innovators and non-adopters. He found that innovators tended to: (1) be younger, (2) know fewer of their peers well, (3) be sought less often for their

advice, (4) receive higher professional ratings, (5) exhibit greater accuracy in the judgment of their rates of innovation adoption, (6) have shorter tenure in their present positions, and (7) seek more advice and information from more persons outside the local area. Non-adopters, by contrast, tended to: (1) have less formal education, (2) receive fewer friendship choices, (3) be less well known by their peers, (4) participate in fewer professional meetings, (5) interact less often with other superintendents in their area, (6) be sought less often for information, (7) receive lower ratings on the professionalism scale, (8) hold less prestigious superintendents, (9) perceive less support from their school board, and (10) rely more on local sources for advice and information.

Studies of the wealth of school districts have also produced mixed results. Ross (1958) and Zeigler and Johnson (1969) claimed that school wealth is the single most powerful predictor of school innovativeness. Studies by Mort and Cornell (1941), Mort (1964), Carlson (1965), and Marcum (1968), which focused on school spending, supported this view. Other studies, including Kohl (1969), Hilfiker (1970), and Hawkins (1968), found no significant relationship between school wealth and innovativeness.

Variables besides per capita expenditures and income, organizational climate, and personality characteristics of administrators have been found related to school innovativeness in a few studies. Two studies found school size was related to innovativeness. Marcum (1968) used the size of the professional staff as an indication of the school size, while Kohl (1969) used the size of the graduating class. Both concluded that the larger the school, the greater the degree of innovativeness. In another study, Matula (1972) attempted to identify factors that contribute to elementary teachers' willingness to try selected classroom social studies innovations. Through use of a simulated adoption situation, Matula found that interest in the innovations and peer support for trying them enhanced the chances that the innovation would be used. It was also found, however, that the greater the complexity of the innovation and the more work it demanded from the teachers, the less likely the innovation would be tried.

Other researchers examined the relationship of geographic location of school systems to innovativeness. Hawkins (1968), for example, found that the most innovative schools tended to be located in homogeneous, middle-class neighborhoods, often near universities or colleges. He also found these an an optimum school district size for innovation.

Individual Teacher Variables. Another group of research studies attempted to determine the characteristics related to individual teacher innovativeness. As cited earlier, Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) identified five categories of individuals. They describe "innovators" in the following manner:

> Venturesomeness is almost an obsession with innovators. They are eager to try new ideas. This interest leads them out of a local circle of peers and into more cosmopolitan social relationships. Communication patterns and friendships among a clique of innovators are common, even though the geographical distance between the innovators may be great. Being an innovator has several prerequisites. These include control of substantial resources to absorb the possible loss due to an unprofitable innovation and the ability to understand and apply complex technical knowledge.
>
> The salient value of the innovator is venturesomeness. He desires the hazardous, the rash, the daring, and the risky. The innovator also must be willing to accept an occasional setback when one of the new ideas he adopts proves unsuccessful. (Rogers and Shoemaker 1971, p. 183)

The results of several studies have found the following characteristics of innovative teachers in contrast to noninnovative teachers: innovative teachers are younger (Leas 1966; Gulesian 1970); use a greater number and variety of information sources (Leas 1966; Gulesian 1970; Dick 1974); have a medium amount (nine to 13) years of teaching experience (McClimans 1967; Dick 1974); and, are outsiders, that is, they come from outside the district and community where they are teaching (Ross 1958; Dick 1974).

Leas (1966) also found that innovative teachers had high social status within the school, were more cosmopolitan than noninnovators, and perceived themselves as opinion leaders in the school. McClimans' study (1967) indicated that innovators held more leadership positions and attended more out-of-town professional meetings than did non-innovative teachers. He also found that females were more innovative

than males.

In a summary of other research on educational innovativeness, Ross (1958) concluded that innovators were more career oriented, more skillful in working with others, and more aware of community values. Age and nature of teacher training, however, were not found significantly related to educational innovativeness in teachers. Miles (1964), in a similar report, concluded that innovators were highly intelligent, possessed keen verbal ability, were less bound by group norms, and were more individualistic and creative than noninnovators.

Conclusion

There are numerous studies on educational and other kinds of innovation and on variables directly related to adoption of innovations by individuals. Several problems, however, prevent the many findings from these studies from being conclusive and widely generalizable. Some problems concern the lack of agreement among researchers over the meaning and value of educational innovation, the wide variety of methodological approaches used in the educational studies, and the conflicting results obtained in many studies. Much research still needs to be conducted on the diffusion of educational innovation.*

---

*Two studies have been completed since the writing of this review of research. Both are the result of major Federally-Funded projects.
See: Berman, Paul and Milbrey McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. IV: The Findings in Review. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1975.
and
Silorski, Linda A., et al. Factors Influencing School Change. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1976.

Purposes and Procedures of this Study

The purpose of this study is to examine some factors that relate to the innovativeness and noninnovativeness of social studies teachers, departments, high schools, and school districts.

SSEC Staff and the Research Team

To establish a multidisciplinary perspective for this research project, the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) staff decided to assemble a team of eight social scientists with expertise in computerized empirical research and in case study fieldwork. It was believed that this composition would enhance the scope of content and methodology in the research effort. The team consisted of a psychologist (John K. Bare, Carleton College), a historian (Richard H. Brown, Newberry Library), a sociologist (J. Ross Eshleman, Wayne State University), an educator (Geneva Gay, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development), an economist (Peter Senn, Wilbur Wright College), a geographer (George Vuicich, Western Michigan University), an anthropologist (James B. Watson, University of Washington), and a political scientist (Harmon Ziegler, University of Oregon).

The original intent was for the research team to clarify the specific objectives and to execute the plans of the research study. The central purpose of the team approach was to ensure the unique perspective of each academic area in planning the study and in examining the schools, social studies programs, and teachers.

The original roles for the SSEC staff and the team, however, were not strictly adhered to. At times, both the staff and the team made significant decisions about research methodology (e.g., sampling procedure) and about substantive matters (e.g., content of questionnaires). Throughout the two-year study, the staff continued to coordinate the procedural aspects of the project, including duplicating and mailing materials, setting up meetings, and communicating with schools. Eventually, the social scientist team became more of a consultation group to the SSEC staff.

Key Questions

Early meetings of the research team and SSEC staff were spent discussing the question, What constitutes innovativeness in social studies education? There was much disagreement among the individual investigators. *Does an innovative social studies teacher:* use inquiry techniques? know about the federally-funded project materials? use those materials? create his or her own materials? involve students in planning? teach more than facts? use individualized instruction? use small-group learning activities? *Do innovative high schools:* have considerable new equipment and multimedia materials? involve teachers in decision making? involve students in decision making? change their programs frequently? employ team teaching? have open-space learning areas?

After much discussion among investigators and staff, social studies innovativeness was defined for purposes of this study as a combination of seven indices: teacher awareness of the federally-funded social studies project materials, extent of use of these materials, frequency of use of these materials, extent of use of 12 other innovative educational practices, degree of teacher participation in school decision-making processes, degree of student involvement in classroom decision making, and extent to which teachers create their own curriculum materials. This list was narrowed eventually to four indices of innovativeness, described in Chapter Two. This definition enabled the investigators to study social studies innovation empirically without focusing on merely one possible indicator of innovation.

The next question tackled by the research team and staff was, What variables probably relate to social studies innovativeness? Suggestions were based on previous research findings and the extensive experience of the investigators and staff in working with teachers and schools. The following categories of variables were formulated:

1) Individual teacher characteristics, such as age, teaching experience, length of tenure, amount of inservice training, involvement in professional organizations, and reading of professional journals.

2) Social studies department characteristics, such as the nature of chairperson's leadership, communication among teachers, nature and

frequency of department meetings, degree of cooperation among department members, and existence and use of a budget.

3) School characteristics such as size, faculty age and racial composition, average faculty tenure and teaching experience, provision for alternative programs, ethnic studies, open-space learning areas, nongraded classes, and administration perceived by teachers as responsive to change.

4) School district characteristics, such as size, wealth, geographic location, political climate, socioeconomic environment, and nature and operation of the school board.

The final question discussed was, What research approach should be used to determine the relationship of these variables to social studies innovativeness? This question produced the most heated debate among the investigators. As was expected, since the team was selected on the basis of differing methods, logical orientations as well as content backgrounds, some favored a large-scale statistical survey of teachers, schools, and districts throughout the country, while others suggested in-depth case studies of several schools based on field observations. Eventually it was decided to use the best aspects of both those approaches. The study would focus on a small number of schools and districts that could be identified as innovative or non-innovative, but would draw on previously conducted large-scale survey studies. Data would be gathered on the selected districts to determine the nature and extent of that innovativeness and the degree to which certain variables seemed related to teacher, department, school, and district innovativeness. These data would include: questionnaire information mailed to social studies teachers and administrators, observation data from school visits, previously gathered census-type data, and political climate information from a previous study by Ziegler and Johnson (1969). These procedures and data are fully explained in the following sections.

Sampling Design and Data-gathering Procedures

Starting with a random national sample of 86 school districts used in a previous study of political interaction by one of the team members

(Ziegler and Jennings 1974), 12 districts were selected to receive questionnaires. Six were initially judged innovative and six non-innovative. From this group, four districts were selected for site surveys (case studies). Two sets of data were already available on these districts--census data and that of the Ziegler and Jennings study (to be described in a later section).

Selecting the 12 districts for the questionnaire process began by ranking the 86 districts according to per capita income--the only variable found consistently related to school innovation in previous studies. (See page 22 of the review of research section.) The staff then contacted the social studies supervisor of each state in which the districts were located to have them rate each district on a one-to-six scale on three characteristics indicative of educational innovation: openness to change, use of innovative social studies practices, and use of new social studies materials. No definitions of either the characteristics or terms were provided. The supervisors responded according to their particular conceptions of "openness" and "innovative." Frequently a second person was sought to rate districts with which the state supervisor was unfamiliar. Sixteen districts were eliminiated due to lack of information. Of the 70 remaining districts, the 12 highest and 12 lowest on per capita income and on innovativeness were chosen. Each of those districts was contacted by the staff and asked to participate in the study. Due to time constraints (end of school year) and other commitments, many districts declined to participate.

Another sample of innovative and noninnovative districts was drawn from the pool of 86 districts. Again those districts that appeared most clearly innovative and noninnovative (according to SSEC rating scales) were selected. After contacting 20 noninnovative districts and 14 innovative districts (according to above criteria), nine districts agreed to participate. Questionnaires* were mailed to either the social studies supervisor of each district or to the department chairperson for distribution to principals, superintendents, and secondary social studies

*See Appendix A for copies of the teachers, principal, and superintendent questionnaires.

teachers. A uniform instruction sheet was sent and the questionnaires, although coded for identification purposes, were placed in sealed envelopes to protect the respondents' anonymity. District supervisors with more than six high schools were instructed to choose six schools that represented the districts range of educational innovativeness and to deliver and collect the forms personally. To provide anonymity for the schools and school districts, fictitious names are used in this report. Table 1 on the following page summarizes the district responses to the questionnaire.

Since the end of both the school year and the project was near, the decision about which districts would be the subjects for case studies was based on which of the districts most promptly and completely returned the questionnaires. A quick hand tabulation of various questionnaire variables was the only knowledge of results obtained prior to the site visits. The purposes of the site visits were to: (1) understand the reality of the school, (2) follow up on selected items on the questionnaires (elaboration, reasons, confirmation, etc.), and (3) explore variables not covered in the questionnaire, such as departmental interaction and teacher conception of the meaning of innovation. Table 2 on page 31 shows the districts and schools visited.

The case studies of each of the small districts (Williams and Flint) included: interviews with all social studies teachers, principal, and superintendent; observations of two teachers; and informal discussions with several students. The site visits to all supervisor-selected high schools in the large districts included: interviews with three to six social studies teachers (out of a ten to 17 total) and the principal or assistant principal in charge of curriculum; observations of from three to seven teachers; and informal discussions with several groups of students.

The department chairperson was interviewed in every high school visited. Other teachers were selected on the basis of several factors, including their teaching schedules and course content. (A range of content areas was desired and, if a sociologist or historian was one of the observers, a course related to either sociology or history was selected for observation.) The investigators had no prior knowledge of the questionnaire responses of the teachers

Table 1

Summary of District Responses

	Name of District	Completed Social Studies Questionnaire	Total # Social Studies Teachers	Percentage Responded	Completed Principal Questionnaire	No. of Schools Participating	Total No. of Schools	Completed Supervisor Questionnaire
Large Non-Innovative Districts	Opal County	79	80	99%	6	6	20+	1
	Dell	21	61	31%	0	5	11	1
	Newhope	30	40	75%	5	6	10+	1
Small Non-Innovative Districts	Flint	3	3	100%	1	1	1	1
	Farmtown	27	27	100%	1	1	1	1
Large Innovative Districts	Diamond County	92	103	89%	6	6	20+	1
	Oceantide	58	64	91%	6	7	7	1
Small Innovative Districts	Williams	5	5	100%	1	1	1	1
	Greenhaven	14	15	93%	1	1	1	1
	TOTAL	329	398	86%	27	34	72+	9

Table 2

List of Observations

District	High Schools	Date of Visit	Number of Investigators
Flint	Flint	May 16, 1975	2
Williams	Williams	May 22-23, 1975	2
Opal	Raintree	May 19, 1975	4
Opal	Riverside	May 20, 1975	2
Opal	Rios	May 20, 1975	2
Diamond	Lighthouse	May 22, 1975	3
Diamond	Stephen A. Douglas	May 22, 1975	3
Diamond	Clouds	May 23, 1975	3
Diamond	Hunter	May 23, 1975	3

in the large high schools. No teacher refused to be interviewed or observed. Some, however, were giving tests or showing a film for the entire period. In such cases, the observer changed plans and interviewed or observed another teacher. (In one school, Clouds, the principal was not interviewed because of a time constraint. Since the social studies chairman had completed the principal's questionnaire for that school, this was not deemed a serious omission.)

With the exception of one school (Williams), the case study interviews were conducted in a standard format. Each person was interviewed individually by one investigator in a room or area where they could be alone. The areas included an office, bookroom, classroom, courtyard, and ballfield. The interviewers asked questions from a standard form and wrote the interviewees responses in short summary statements on the form. The major topics on the form were social studies curriculum teaching practices, departmental interaction, and innovation and decision making. (See the Appendix A for the actual forms.)

The interviews lasted from 40 to 60 minutes. Later that day, the interviewer elaborated on the responses either by talking

individually into a tape recorder or by participating in a structured roundtable discussion with other investigators of that school. Typed transcriptions of these recordings were made following the completion of all site visits.

No forms were used to record the classroom observations. The investigators, however, were told to arrive at class early, take an unobtrusive seat, and observe quietly, taking a minimum of notes. The observers focused on physical setting of classroom (seats, walls, etc.), the appearance of teachers and students, the instructional methods used (lecture, discussion, question/answer, inquiry, etc.), the grouping of students (individualized, small group, entire class), the levels of questioning (factual recall vs. analysis or evaluation), and the degree of teacher or student centeredness. The observers later recorded elaborations of their observations in a manner similar to that of the interviews. The observations and interviews with teachers often included the collection of various artifacts from the school. These items included: tests, homework assignments, course outlines, special memoranda, textbook lists, school newspapers, and evaluation forms.

The informal discussions with students were completely unstructured. They took place between classes, in classrooms, libraries, lunchrooms, and outside in courtyards. Investigators simply asked students if they could talk to them a few minutes about their school. The students never refused and were often anxious to talk. Questions frequently asked were: How do you like going to school here? Why? What's the best/worst thing about this school? Do you have any social studies classes? How are they? What neat things have you done in social studies? In school? Are there any racial problems here?

The Data--Description, Analysis, and Use

Four different data sets were available for the four school districts participating in the case studies: census data, Ziegler's school board data, the questionnaire data, and the swift site survey data. Each of these is described below:

1) Census Data. This consists of data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) *School District Fourth Count Tape*. It contains 1970 Census Bureau data on social and economic variables, such as income, enrollment, dropout status, ethnic status, migration, and occupation, for each U.S. school district with an enrollment of 300 or more and for a sample of smaller districts.

2) Ziegler's School Board Study Data. These data, embodying over 400 variables, were obtained by administering a lengthy interview schedule to a random sample of 86 school boards and superintendents across the country, as part of a study of political interaction within local school districts conducted by the Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration at the University of Oregon and published in a recent book (Ziegler and Jennings 1974). The variables composing these data consist primarily of superintendent and school board member perceptions of and attitudes toward district problems (including racial and financial), education groups (NEA, AFT, etc.), teacher behavior, teacher roles in program change, and superintendent-school board conflict.

3) Social Studies Innovation Questionnaire Data. This includes data gathered by this research project from questionnaires completed by teachers, principals, and superintendents in nine school districts throughout the country. The data for social studies teachers include seven dependent variables hypothesized as indicators of educational innovation: awareness, frequency, and extensiveness of use of 24 social studies project materials; extent of use of various general educational innovations, such as instructional television, non-traditional grading, and values clarification; level of teacher involvement in school decision making; level of student involvement in school and classroom decision making; and degree to which teachers can use materials they have created themselves in and out of the classroom. Among the many independent variables are: age, teaching experience, involvement in professional organizations, and reading professional journals.

The questionnaire also provides data on (1) teacher and principal perceptions about the extent the school engages in innovative practices, such as providing alternative programs, open-space classrooms, and ethnic studies courses; (2) processes and persons responsive to change; and (3) communication with parents and the community. Size and racial composition of the student body and faculty are other school variables.

District level data include: number of high schools, student and faculty population, number of social studies teachers, experience level of the superintendent and superintendent perceptions of the effect of teacher decision making, student involvement, and general educational innovation in the district. (See the Appendix A for copies of the teacher, principal, and superintendent questionnaires.)

4) Site Survey (Case Study) Data. The data from the case studies of four school districts were gathered primarily through structured interviews with the principals or assistant principals, department chairpersons, and a sample of social studies teachers in each school, and through semistructured observations of a sample of social studies teachers and classrooms. Additional data were gathered by talking informally to several students and by random observation of numerous aspects of the school. For the two small districts, the superintendent was also interviewed.

Variables embodied in the interviews of social studies teachers include:

Curriculum Program: Materials used and developed, who decides on materials used, the program four to five years ago, and the most desired future change in curriculum.

Teaching Practices: Attitude toward counteracting racism and sexism and imparting certain values to students, names of professional journals read regularly, and specific examples of innovative practices engaged in by teachers.

Departmental Interaction: Nature, frequency, and worth of department meetings; degree of cooperation among members; who opinion leaders are; and role and style of chairperson.

Decision Making and Innovation: Degree and example of support for change from principal, superintendent, and social studies teachers;

teacher conception of meaning of innovation; degree of satisfaction with current level of teacher participation and student involvement in decision making.

The department chairperson interview schedule also included items on the size of the social studies budget, the type of courses offered, community reaction to the social studies program, and closest colleges and universities.

The principal interview schedule included questions about perceptions of their role in effecting change, how they encourage teacher participation in decision making, their attitudes toward level of teacher participation in decision making, the reward systems for teachers, how accountability laws affect local planning, staff and department turnover rate, opinion leaders, and nature of staff meetings.

The classroom observations focused on variables such as the physical setting (arrangement of desks, displays, walls and windows, climate), interaction between students and teacher (levels of questioning and thinking, interest and motivation, kind of relationship, discipline and behavior), social studies content and teaching methods (facts, concepts, generalizations, hypotheses, inquiry, lecture, question answering, games and simulations, role playing, etc.), and the grouping of students (homo- vs. heterogeneous, entire class vs. small-group vs. individualized instruction).

Other data collected included each principal's rating of the social studies department compared to other school departments and examples of teacher-created or adapted curriculum materials.

Several types of analyses were performed with these data. First, there was an effort to determine whether several factors could be isolated and identified that would indicate innovativeness of social studies teachers and whether other variables were significantly related to teacher innovativeness. To accomplish this goal, the SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) Cross-Tabulation program was run for the 206 teachers in the five districts that responded most promptly and completely to the questionnaire. These districts were: Flint (3), Williams (5), Farmtown (27), Opal County

(79), and Diamond County (92). This program involved generating cross-tabulation tables for seven indices of innovation against 32 independent variables, including: age, teaching experience, professional journals read, salary level, and each of the other dependent variables. Three of the seven indices of innovation were eliminated. For two--frequency and extent of use of the social studies project materials--the range of responses was so narrow that very few teachers could be identified as high on those measures. A third index was eliminiated because of ambiguity in how the teachers interpreted "commercially published." Thus, four main indices of innovation were left: awareness of the social studies project materials, use of various innovative practices, participation in school decision-making processes, and involving students in classroom decisions. Analysis of the interrelationships among these four indices and between each of them and the 32 independent variables is the basis of Chapter 2, Teacher Innovativeness, of this report.

Chapter 3, Social Studies Department and High School Innovativeness, is based on two different data sources. First, the SPSS Frequencies program was run for selected variables on the teacher questionnaires for each of the nine high schools visited. The variables included: teacher age, sex, experience, number of years at that school, college course credit hours, professional journals read, professional meetings attended, as well as the four dependent variables chosen as indicators of innovation. The statistics provided by this program included for each variable: absolute, relative, and cumulative frequencies; mean; mode; median; standard deviation; variance; and maximum-minimum responses. The second source of data was the information gathered by the site surveys. Combining these two data sources, a profile of each school was written by one of the participating observers and critiqued by the others. The profiles of the two small schools visited and a comparison of the schools is the basis of Innovation in Two Small Rural High Schools, a subsection of Chapter 3. Profiles of two high schools in one of the large innovative districts and a comparison of those schools is the basis of the second subsection of Chapter 3, Innovation in Two Large Urban/Suburban High Schools. The

remaining five profiles are in Appendix B.

Finally, in an effort to examine social studies innovativeness on a district level, several other analyses were done. Concentrating only on the two large districts visited--Opal County (noninnovative according to the state supervisor ratings) and Diamond County (innovative according to those ratings)--three types of data were analyzed. First, based on the 79 teacher questionnaires from Opal and 92 from Diamond, a frequency distribution and an SPSS Condescriptive program were run on all variables for each of the two districts. In addition to the number and percentage of responses to each item, this analysis also produced mean, standard error, standard deviation, sum of squares, kurtosis, skewness, and range for each variable. The other two sources of district data were the census information and Ziegler's school board data for Opal and Diamond counties. Analysis and comparison of the frequency distributions and mean scores from these three sources is the basis of School District Innovativeness, Chapter 4.

We realize that these analyses would lead to a very limited kind of results. Unfortunately, financial constraints of the project prevented further statistical analyses.

Chapter Two

TEACHER INNOVATIVENESS

Based on the questionnaire responses of the 206 secondary social studies teachers in our sample, this chapter attempts to describe teacher innovativeness and its relationship with 31 other variables. For the purposes of this study, teacher innovativeness consists of four indices: awareness of social studies project materials, use of various innovative teaching practices, participation in school decision making, and involving students in classroom decisions. Each of these four indexes is explained. Then, from examining the six cross-tabulation tables generated by interrelating each of the four indexes with one another, the relationships among these four variables are discussed. Thus, for example, the extent to which correlations exist between awareness of materials and use of certain innovative practices is described. Finally, the relationship between 31 independent variables--such as sex, teaching experience, and age--and each of the four indexes of innovativeness is explored. This discussion is based on examining the 31 cross-tabulation tables for each index. Before presenting those analyses, however, a brief discussion of the representativeness of our sample is provided.

Representativeness of the Sample

The 206 secondary social studies teachers from five school districts who formed the sample for the Teacher Innovativeness analysis were not randomly selected or chosen to represent a cross-section of teachers in the United States. Nevertheless, that group of 206 teachers is similar on several key characteristics to secondary teachers and/or all secondary social studies teachers in the nation. The following table compares our sample with the population of secondary teachers in the country.

Table 3

Comparison of Sample with All U.S. Secondary Public School Teachers

	All Secondary Public School Teachers in U.S.*			The Sample of 206 Secondary Social Studies Teachers		
Teacher's Age (Mean)	36 yrs.			35 yrs.		
Teacher's Experience (Median)	7 yrs.			8 yrs.		
Teacher's Salary (Mean)	$9,449			$10,800		
	BA	MA	Other	BA	MA	Other
Teacher's Degree	64%	34%	2%	53%	46%	1%
	M	F		M	F	
Teacher's Sex	53%	47%		71%	29%	

*Based on Table 52, "Selected Characteristics of Public School Teachers, by Level and by Sex: United States, 1970-71," published in Grant, W. Vance and C. George Lind (National Center for Education Statistics), *Digest of Educational Statistics, 1974 Edition,* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975, p. 48.

Thus, our sample of social studies teachers is very similar to the secondary public school teachers in age and experience. Moreover, when one allows for the increase in the average salary since the 1971 data was gathered, the two groups are also similar in average salary. Our sample contains a somewhat larger percentage of teachers wtih master's degrees than the national population (46 percent to 34 percent). This should be recalled when interpreting and generalizing from the results of this study. One suspects, however, that 46 percent is near the percentage of secondary *social studies* teachers in the United States who have master's degrees. More English and social studies teachers tend to have master's degrees than mathematics and science teachers.

Finally, the sex distribution of our sample is substantially different from the population of secondary teachers--Males: 71 percent to 53 percent. Statistics on sex were, however, available for secondary *social studies* teachers. As the figures below indicate our sample had only slightly more female teachers than the population of secondary social studies teachers:

Table 4

Comparison of Sample with All U.S. Secondary Social Studies Teachers

	All Secondary Social Studies Teachers in U.S.**		The Sample of 206 Secondary Social Studies Teachers	
Teacher's Sex	M	F	M	F
	76%	24%	71%	29%

**From Table 54, "Public Secondary Teachers, by teaching field and by sex: United States, 1970-71," in *Digest of Educational Statistics, 1974 ed.*, p. 48.

Therefore, we conclude that our sample of 206 secondary social studies teachers is reasonably representative of all secondary social studies teachers or secondary public school teachers in terms of age, teaching experience, salary, and sex.

The Four Main Indices of Innovation

Awareness of Social Studies Projects

This index is a weighted average of the teachers' responses to 24 items that relate to a variety of social studies curriculum materials. For each of the 24 materials (see Appendix A, Social Studies Teachers Questionnaire, p. 10), the teacher checked a square. Zero was recorded if the teacher said he or she was not aware of the materials; 1, aware of materials; 2, examined materials; and 3, received instruction in use of materials. The items were mainly the titles of published materials or projects that produced social studies materials in the late 1960s.

The average of all the responses was .602, or six-tenths of the distance between not being aware of any materials and simply being aware of all the materials. This is a clear indication that most of the teachers were not aware of the materials.

The average is difficult to interpret because it is composed of a large range of answers to 24 items. For instance, the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project had an average of .345 while the Carnegie-

Mellon materials, *Comparative Political Systems,* had an average of 1.15. This is a three to one range. *Economics in Society* had an average of only .238. Therefore, the range between the lowest and the highest was more than four to one. There is little doubt that most teachers were not aware of the social studies project materials.

When the data were recoded for processing, they were broken down into four categories of unequal intervals. If a respondent's average on all 24 items was from zero to .15, that person was coded as one; from .16 to .49, as two; from .5 to .99, as three; and from 1.0 to 3.0, as four. Only 46 teachers out of the sample of 206 were coded as four. These 46 teachers were 22.3 percent of the sample. In the analysis that follows, the key word to describe these teachers is *aware. Awareness* means that the teacher *said* he or she was aware or had examined materials or had received instruction in their use.

For brevity (and assuming the results are valid), the report often states that "teachers were aware" rather than that "they said they were aware."

Use of Innovative Practices

On page 8 of the Social Studies Teachers Questionnaire (Appendix A), the teachers were given a list of 12 activities that could be defined as innovative practices, including such things as nontraditional grading systems and participation in team teaching. The teachers were asked to rank the extent to which they "engaged in the educational activities." They ranked them as follows: 1 = little, 2 = moderately and 3 = great. The index--labelled *usage* or *use*--is the sum of the responses the teachers gave to these 12 items. For example, if they engaged in none of the activities, the sum would be zero. If they engaged in all the activities to a great extent, the total would be 36. In other words, for each of the 12 items a maximum score of 3 is possible and the range is from 0 to 36.

The average for all of the teachers was 16.77, which is not quite halfway between little and moderate. Another way to put it is that the teachers, on the average, saw themselves as using the listed educational activities more than a little but nowhere near moderately.

Once again the average masks a very wide range of almost five to one for the 12 items. The lowest average was .54 for the usage of computer-assisted instruction and the highest was 2.31 for combating sexism and racism. Interpreting these in another way, there was less than a little use of computer-assisted instruction but more than a moderate extent of combating racism and sexism by the teachers.

The findings on racism and sexism cast some doubt on either the representativeness of the sample or the teachers' understanding of the questionnaire or both, unless, however, a vigorous attack on racism and sexism has been unnoticed by other school observers. Nevertheless, the average is probably fairly representative because so many items were included. Errors of interpretation on one side might have been offset by other errors of interpretation on the other.

In the coding, a score of 0 through 14 was assigned a one; 15 through 20, a two; and 21 through 31, a three. At least one teacher scored a 31, close to the maximum of 36 and at least one teacher scored 0, no use of any innovative practice.

Consistent with our attempt to isolate innovators and innovative practices, *users* will refer only to those who scored between 21 and 31. Sixty-five teachers, or 31.6 percent of our sample put themselves into this group. In other words, almost a third of the teachers sampled stated that they made a somewhat moderate use of the 12 innovative practices listed. Often we will simply state that these teachers "used innovative practices." *Use* or *usage* in the future reports refers, then, to about 65 teachers, with scores ranging from 21 to 31 out of a possible 36, with the average for all the teachers being 16.77.

Participation by Teachers in Decision Making

This is an index of teachers' perceptions of how often they participate in making decisions. On page 6 of the Social Studies Teachers Questionnaire, the teachers were asked to estimate the frequency of their participation in decision making over six areas, ranging from curriculum program changes to budget decisions (see Appendix A). They were asked to mark a zero if they never participated,

a one if seldom participated, two if they participated some and three if they participated often.

The overall average was .666, which might be interpreted that the teachers thought that they participated in decision making more than "never" but not quite "seldom." At least one teacher felt that he/she never participated in any decision making and got a socre of zero. The highest score for at least one teacher was 2.3, indicating that teacher felt he/she participated a little more often than "some."

Once again the overall average masks a wide range in the individual averages. The overall average for participation in hiring new administrators was .0097. For all practical purposes, all the teachers indicated they never participated in hiring new administrators. The highest average was with respect to the selection of curriculum materials, where the index was 1.49, indicating that the teachers, by and large, felt that they participated more than "seldom" in the selection of these materials.

An interesting question that deserves more investigation is the differences between the teachers' perceptions of how much they actually participated in making decisions as opposed to how much they felt they were encouraged to participate in decision making by their administrators. Without the full data, it appears that the teachers felt they were encouraged to participate much more than they actually did.

In the coding, a score of 0 to .4 was given a one, .5 to .9 was given a two, and from 1 to 3 scored as a three. Therefore, when the key word *participate* or *participation* is used, it will refer only to those teachers whose average was one or more. This includes 53 teachers, or 25.7 percent of the sample. Put another way, persons receiving a high index on this variable perceive themselves as participating seldom, some, or often. Frequently, this report states that these teachers "participated" rather than merely "said they participated."

In general both the very low average and the low maximum score indicate that the teachers in this sample did not see themselves as participating very much in decisions.

Involvement of Students in Classroom

On page 7 of the Social Studies Teachers Questionnaire, the teachers were asked, "To what extent are the students in your classroom asked for

formal participation in the following areas?" (see Appendix A). Six items, ranging from "choosing learning activities" to "evaluating you as a teacher," were then listed. The teachers were to score each item on the following scale: zero for no extent, one for little extent, two for moderate extent, and three for great extent. The index is a weighted average of these scores and, thus, the value can vary from zero to three. The average for all the teachers for all the items was 1.31, which might be interpreted as more than a little but less than a moderate extent. At least one teacher reported no formal student involvement for any items, and at least one teacher reported a great extent for every item. The range of the averages was the lowest of any of the four indexes under discussion. It was .95 for teacher evaluation of students' work at the bottom end and 1.76 for students' evaluation of their own work at the top end.

In the coding 0 through .9 was coded as a one, 1 through 1.4 as a two, 1.5 through 1.9 as a three and 2 through 3 as a four.

In the analysis that follows, the key word will be *involved* or *involvement*. It will refer only to classrooms where provisions have been made for formal student involvement and the involvement is at least moderate. In other words, this analysis focuses on those classrooms where teachers stated that student involvement is moderate or more. Frequently the report states that these teachers "involved their students" rather than merely "stated that they involved" them.

Only 39 teachers of the sample of 206, or 18.9 percent, said they involved their students "moderately" or more on the listed items. When we speak, then, of *involvement* or *student involvement*, we refer only to those 39 teachers.

Interrelationship Among the Four Indices of Innovation

Teacher Awareness and Innovative Practices

There is a strong and clear relationship between teacher awareness of the social studies project materials and teacher use of a variety of general innovative teaching practices, such as instructional television, community-based learning activities, and inquiry teaching. The more a

teacher uses innovative practices, the more likely the teacher is to be aware of project materials. Only 14 percent of the low awareness teachers use innovative practices extensively, while 52 percent of the awareness teachers do. Also, of those teachers who use innovative practices extensively only 11 percent have the lowest awareness of materials, while 37 percent have the highest awareness.

Teacher Awareness and Student Involvement

Although the relationship is not obvious or strong, the more teachers perceive that they involve students in classroom decision making, the more those teachers are aware of the social studies project materials. As the level of student involvement increases, the percentage of aware teachers increases from 11 percent to 37 percent. Also, as the level of teacher awareness increases the percentage of teachers who perceive that they involve their students increases from 15 percent to 44 percent. The 17 teachers who are most aware and who state that they involve their students the most make up 37 percent of the aware teachers and 44 percent of the teachers who most involve their students. (See Appendix C, section 4, Crosstabulation Table SSPRJAWA by STDTINV.)

Teacher Awareness and Participation in Decision Making

There is no clear relationship between the level of teacher awareness of the social studies project materials and the degree of teacher participation in school decision making. Twenty-eight percent of the teachers who participated in decision making seldom or more were aware, while 26 percent of the teachers who participated less than seldom were aware. (See Appendix C, Crosstab Table SSPRJAWA by TEACHDEC.)

Innovative Practices and Student Involvement

There is a strong correspondence between teacher use of general innovative practices and the extent to which teachers perceive that they involve students in classroom decision making. The higher the innovative practice score the better the chance that the teacher states that he or she provides for student involvement. Only 10 percent of the teachers who provide for little or no student involvement use innovative practices

to a moderate or great extent, while 70 percent of the teachers who provide for a moderate or great degree of student involvement also use innovative practices to that extent. As a teacher's level of student involvement increases, the percentage of teachers who use innovative practices at least moderately increase from 8 percent to 42 percent. (See Appendix C, section 5, Crosstab Table INNPRCTR by STDINV.)

Innovative Practices and Teacher Participation in Decision Making

There appears to be a connection between these two variables. The more a teacher uses innovative practices, the greater the possibility that the teacher perceives himself or herself as participating in school decision making processes seldom or more. This percentage of "participating" teachers increases from 25 percent to 43 percent as the extent of their use of innovative practices increases. (See Appendix C, section 6, Crosstab Table INNPRCTR by TEACHDEC.)

Student Involvement and Teacher Participation in Decision Making

There is a slight relationship between these two variables. If teachers said they involved students in classroom decision making moderately or more, they were slightly more likely to feel they (teachers) partcipated in school decision making. However, only 18 teachers were high on both indices. These 18 teachers, on the other hand, accounted for 46 percent of the teachers who involved their students moderately or more and 34 percent of the teachers who said they participated in school decision making seldom or more. (See Appendix C, section 7, Crosstab Table, STDINV by TEACHDEC.)

Summary and Discussion

The index of teachers' use of general innovative practices appears to be strongly related to each of the other three indices of innovation. A high score in innovative practice usage corresponds with student involvement in the classroom, teacher participation in decision making, and teacher awareness of project materials. To put the matter in perspective, however, it must be kept in mind that only 24 teachers are in the highest category of both project awareness and high innovative practice usage. Only 23 teachers are in the highest category of

perceiving themselves as participating in decisions and using innovative practices. Only 27 teachers are in the highest category of involving their students and using innovative practices.

The relationships between innovative practices and the other three indices probably occur partly because several components of the practices index are directly related to the other indices. "Use of student feedback to make changes," for example, relates directly to making provisions for student involvement in classroom decisions. "Use of community based learning activities" and "inquiry as discovery teaching methods" are embodied in many of the social studies project materials that composed the awareness index. The relationship may also be strong because each of the four indices is tapping a characteristic of the teacher that is common to each of the indices, although most pervasive in innovative practices--the desire to do new and different things would lead teachers to explore new materials, engage in innovative practices, and involve themselves and their students in decision making related to their particular spheres of influence.

Making provisions for student involvement in classroom decision making corresponds somewhat but not strongly with teacher awareness of social studies project materials and teacher participation in school decision making. Once again, however, only a small number of teachers score high on both student involvement and awareness (17) and on student involvement and teacher decision making (18).

The connection between teachers involving students in classroom decision making and participating themselves in school decision making may be due to the tendency common to both actions of broadening the degree of participation in educational decision making. The fact that the association is not stronger may be due to school factors (principal's support for example) inhibiting teachers' efforts to participate in school decision making, while leaving them free to institute changes in their own classrooms. These factors might also be responsible for the relationship between teacher participation in decision making and teacher awareness of new materials.

The few indications of organizational climate that were gathered tend to support this hypothesis. If teachers stated that the administration encouraged them more than a little to participate in decision making, they felt that they did participate in those decisions to a greater extent than they did if they were not encouraged at all. This is a weak finding, since only five teachers in the sample incicated that they were even moderately encouraged.

There was also a slight relationship between how teachers perceived the school in terms of using innovative practices and the extent to which they said they used those practices. Once the *school* was perceived as using, to more than a little extent, those practices, then it was more likely that the *teachers* said they used innovative practices.

By contrast, however, there was no clear relationship between how much teachers perceived the school as making formal provisions for student involvement in school decisions and themselves as making provisions for student involvement in the classroom. This finding, however, seems reasonable. Teachers are still very autonomous in classroom matters and, therefore, could involve or not involve students regardless of the school tendency.

There is a more direct connection between perceived characteristics of the school and the performance of the teachers on the other two variables. Some innovative practices, such as team teaching and instructional television, for instance, need school support before individual teachers can use them. Also, if administrators do not encourage teacher participation in decisions such as formulating the budget and hiring new teachers and administrators, it is difficult for teachers to engage in such decision making.

Thus, five of the six possible interrelationships among the four indices of innovation were somewhat or strongly related. We assume that the basis for these interrelationships is a quality we term *teacher innovativeness*. In addition, two of these indices--teacher participation in decision making and teacher use of innovative practices--were somewhat related to certain perceived characteristics of the school.

Awareness of Social Studies Project Materials

Teacher awareness of the social studies project materials corresponded somewhat or strongly with the following variables. (Note: Only 46 of 206 teachers were aware of many social studies project materials.)

Sex: Generally males were slightly more aware than females. Twenty-four percent of the males were aware, while only 18.6 percent of the females were; while males comprised 71 percent of the total sample, they made up 76 percent of the aware teachers.

Age: Teachers over 40 were more likely to be aware than teachers under 40, but the correlation between age and awareness was not strong. Thirty-one percent of the teachers over 40 years old were aware, while only 17 percent of the under-40 teachers were aware.

Race: White teachers were more likely to be aware than black teachers. Twenty-six percent (42 of 162) of the white teachers were aware while only 11 percent (2 of 18) of the black teachers were aware. Of the aware teachers, 91 percent were white, 4 percent black, and 5 percent other racial/ethnic backgrounds. Of the total sample 51 percent were white, 9 percent black, and 10 percent other.

Tenure: If teachers did not have tenure, they would most likely not be aware (80 percent of the nontenured teachers were not aware). If teachers were aware, they most likely had tenure (80 percent of the aware teachers had tenure).

Position: Chairpersons who also taught were much more likely to be aware than full-time social studies teachers. Sixty-seven percent of the chairpersons were aware while only 20.5 percent of the full-time teachers were. Although chairpersons comprised only 4.4 percent of the total sample they comprised 13 percent of the aware teachers.

Degree: Teachers with master's degrees and beyond are much more likely to be aware than teachers with bachelor's degrees but less than a master's. While 31 percent of the MA teachers were aware, only 16 percent of the BA teachers were. Also, while the total sample was comprised of only 46 percent MAs, the aware teachers were composed of 61 percent MAs.

Inservice: Teachers with 20 or more hours of inservice training related to social studies education were more likely to be aware than those with less than 20 hours. Although teachers with 20 or more hours comprised only 19 percent of the total sample, they comprised 44 percent of the aware teachers.

Professional Organizations: Teachers belonging to three or four professional organizations were more likely to be aware than teachers belonging to less than three. Forty percent of the teachers who belonged to three to four organizations were aware, while only 16 percent of the other teachers were. Also, 48 percent of the aware group were teachers belonging to three to four organizations.

Professional Journals: As a group, those who read no journals were less aware than those who did. Significantly, increased awareness occurred, however, only for those who read four or more journals regularly. Fifty percent of those teachers who read four or more journals were aware while only 7.5 percent who read none were aware.

Number of Courses Taught: Although no strong relationship existed between number of courses teachers had taught more than once in the last three years and their level of awareness, teachers with the maximum score of six courses tended to be aware in significantly higher percentages (42.5 percent) than the groups of teachers who taught less than six courses (12 to 27 percent).

Little or no correlation was found between teacher awareness of the social studies project materials and the following variables:

Number of years teaching experience

Number of years in the present school system

Percent of teaching time spent on social studies

Amount of released time

Teacher's salary

Teacher's undergraduate major

Number of college credit hours

Number of professional meetings attended in last three years

Teacher use of commercially published materials

Many variables appeared to be related to teacher awareness of the social studies project materials. The strongest relationships were found between awareness and tenure, current position, and degree. Tenured teachers, chairpersons, and teachers with master's degrees or beyond were much more likely to be aware than their counterparts. Since chairpersons usually receive the attention of publishers, it seems reasonable that they would more likely be aware of any given set of social studies materials, including those of the federally funded projects. Teachers with master's degrees might have been exposed to courses that made them aware of these materials. Since neither the amount of teaching experience nor the number of years in the present system was related to awareness, the tenure relationship is more difficult to explain. Perhaps the only reason a relation appears in the latter case is that tenure is a dichotomous variable (only two categories), while the other two are continuous (with six to seven categories). Indeed when teachers are divided into those with less than 14 years experience and those with 14 or more years, an association appears--the latter teachers are more likely to be aware.

This type of relationship also appears for age (over 40 more aware), inservice training (those with 20 or more hours were more aware), professional organizations (those with three or more memberships were more aware), professional journals (those who read four or more were more aware), and number of courses taught (those with six were more aware). Each of these factors generally relates to a broadening of the teacher's activity and contact. It might indicate that until a certain level of activity is reached, there is no significant change in awareness of the project materials.

Finally, two other dichotomous variables seemed to be slightly related to awareness. Males were slightly more likely to be aware than females and white teachers more than blacks (white males formed the overwhelming majority of the sample). Since the number of blacks in the sample is small (18 of 206) the latter finding is not conclusive.

Teacher Use of Innovative Practices

Teacher use of various innovative practices, such as inquiry teaching, instructional television, and values clarification, seemed somewhat or strongly related to the following variables. (Note: Sixty-five teachers, or about 32 percent of the sample composed the high-index group on this variable. That group was composed of teachers who stated that they made a somewhat moderate use of the 12 innovative practices listed on the questionnaire.)

Tenure: Teachers without tenure were slightly more likely to be users of innovative practices than those with tenure. Thirty-eight percent of the nontenured teachers were users, as compared to 29 percent of the tenured teachers.

Teaching Time: Those who teach social studies 75 percent or more of the time are somewhat more likely to use innovative practices. Over one-third of the teachers who spend 75 percent or more of their teaching time on social studies use innovative practices, while only one-fourth of those who teach between 50 to 75 percent, and one-sixth of those who teach less than 50 percent social studies use innovative practices. The last group (under 50 percent) contained only six teachers, however.

College Courses: Teachers who have taken nine or more credit hours of college courses related to teaching social studies in the last three years have a clear tendency to use innovative practices more than teachers who have less than nine hours. Forty-one percent of the 70 teachers who have taken nine or more hours use innovative practices, while only 26 percent of the 136 teachers who have taken less than nine hours are users.

Professional Organizations: Teachers who belong to three or four professional organizations are clearly more likely to use innovative practices than those who belong to fewer organizations. Forty-seven percent of the teachers who belong to three organizations and 40 percent of those teachers who belong to four organizations are users, as compared to 21 percent for members of none, 32 percent for members of one, and 29 percent for members of two organizations.

Few connections were found between teacher use of innovative practices and the following variables:

Sex

Age

Racial/Ethnic backgrounds of the teachers

Number of years teaching experience (except that half of the ten teachers who had less than a year experience used innovative practices)

Number of years teachers were in school system

Current position (One-third [three of nine] of the department chairpersons used innovative practices and nearly 30 percent of the full-time teachers did. So there was no difference.)

Amount of Released Time

Salary

Degree

Academic Major (Nearly half [46 percent] of the education majors were users of innovative practices but they are only 14 percent of the sample. The percentages of users in other majors were history, 30 percent and social science, 36 percent.)

Inservice training (Nearly half [five of 11] of the teachers who had 39 hours or more of inservice training used innovative practices.)

Number of professional meetings attended

Number of professional journals read (But 64 percent [nine of 14] of those teachers who read five or more journals were users as compared to percentages of 47 to 13 percent of teachers who read from four to zero journals.)

Number of courses taught

Use of commercially produced materials

Number of college courses and professional memberships were the variables which were strongly and positively associated with teacher use of innovative practices. In both cases a certain level seemed to correspond to use of various general educational practices. Thus, teachers with nine or more hours of courses in social studies and those who belonged to three or more organizations clearly use innovative practices more pervasively than those below those levels. Perhaps the variety of courses and contact with organizations exposed these teachers to more new ideas and involved them with groups of teachers who reinforced the tendency to use those new ideas. Since there was a slight

tendency for teachers who read five or more journals to use practices more than others, this hypothesis seems reasonable.

There was also a slight tendency for nontenured teachers and those who taught social studies more than 75 percent of the time to use innovative practices. Those whose primary responsibility--and therefore, probably, training--was in social studies would have more time and energy to focus on doing new things rather than merely teaching the content. The use of these practices by nontenured teachers could be due partly to their recent contact with college courses that stressed those ideas. Since a number of college courses strongly correlated with use of innovative practices and since half of the teachers with less than one year experience used innovative practices, this conclusion seems reasonable.

While all other variables did not relate to the use of innovative practices, teachers who majored in education were somewhat more likely to use innovative practices than history or social science majors. This seems reasonable since schools of education stress methodology, especially new techniques and strategies, while the academic departments would stress the content of the areas.

Thus, a composite picture of the teacher most likely to use various innovative practices might be the teacher who had recently taken many college courses related to teaching social studies, especially education courses; who belonged to several organizations; who taught mostly social studies; but who did not have tenure.

Teacher Participation in School Decision Making

The frequency with which teachers participate in school decision making in areas such as changing the curriculum, hiring new teachers and administrators, and formulating the budget is associated somewhat or strongly with the following variables. (Note: Fifty-three teachers of the 206 in the sample [26 percent] form the high index group on this variable. These teachers perceive themselves as participating seldom, sometimes, or often.)

Sex: Women saw themselves as slightly more involved in decision making than the men. Twenty-nine percent of the female teachers participated in decision making while 24 percent of the male teachers did. Also, while the women comprised 29 percent of the total sample, they formed one-third of the participating teachers.

Tenure: Nontenured teachers were slightly more likely to see themselves as participating in school decisions than tenured teachers. Thirty-two percent of the nontenured teachers perceived themselves as participating while only 23 percent of the tenured teachers did.

Current Position: Over half of the chairpersons (five of nine) saw themselves as participating in school decision making while less than one-fourth of the full-time teachers (43 of 185) did.

Degree: To a slight degree, teachers with master's degrees were more likely to see themselves as involved in decision making than those with bachelor's degrees. Twenty-eight of MAs saw themselves as participating while 23 percent of the BAs did.

Little or no relationship was found between the frequency of teacher participation in school decision making and the following variables:

Age (Except that the youngest teachers do not perceive themselves as participating in school decisions)

Race

Teaching experience

Years experience in school system

Percent of teaching time spent on social studies

Amount of released time

Salary

Academic degree

Inserve training (Except that 46 percent [five of 11] of the teachers who had 37 or more hours of inservice training saw themselves as participating in decision making while the other group's percentage of perceived participation was much less [from 20 to 33 percent].)

College credits

Membership in professional organizations

Professional meetings

Professional journals, number of (Except that 57 percent [eight of 14] teachers who read five or more journals saw themselves as participating. This was by far a high percentage than any other group of readers [19 to 29 percent].)

Number of courses taught

Use of commercially published material

Of the four indices of innovation in this study, teacher participation in school decision making had the weakest correspondence with the independent variables under consideration. The only variables to which teacher decision making appeared related to any degree were sex, tenure, position, and degree. Even those relationships were very weak.

Females, nontenured teachers, and holders of master's degrees saw themselves as slightly more involved than their counterparts. Slightly more women indicated that they were involved in school decision making than men. More nontenured teachers also stated that they participated in decision making than did tenured teachers. Perhaps the latter teachers have a more extreme view of what constitutes *real* participation in school decisions, whereas nontenured teachers, new to the system, might be more likely to interpret even the slightest input into minor decisions as real participation. However, since number of years in the present system did not correlate with teacher decision making, this hypothesis is very weak. The slight tendency for master's degree holders to be more involved than those with bachelor's degrees confuses the results even more, since more of the former would have tenure than the latter.

The clearest, but also least surprising, result was that more department chairpersons saw themselves as participating in decision making than regular teachers. This must surely be due to the nature of the position, especially in large school districts, where the department chairperson functions as a quasi-administrator. Interviews with department chairpersons tended to confirm this hypothesis, although it is not known exactly from which districts the five chairpersons who said they participated came.

Although there were some interesting aspects of the relationship between teacher decision making and several other variables such as age, inservice training, and number of professional journals teachers read, there was no apparent relationship to the other variables.

Student Involvement in Classroom Decision Making

The extent to which teachers said they made provisions for formal student involvement in classroom decision, such as choosing content and learning activities and evaluating the teacher, appeared to correspond somewhat or strongly with the following variables. (Note: 39 of the 206 teachers in the sample [19 percent] said they involved their students in classroom decision making.)

Sex: A greater percentage of women (25 percent) said they involved their students in decision making than men (16 percent). Also, although women comprised 29 percent of the total sample they made up nearly 40 percent of the teachers who involved their students.

Race: Black teachers were far more likely to involve their students in decision making than white teachers. Fifty percent of the blacks (nine of 18) involved students while only 17 percent (28 of 162) of the whites did.

Teaching Experience: Teachers with less than four years experience were most likely to involve students in decision making than any other group. Twenty-eight percent of those teachers involved students, as opposed to percentages ranging from 10 to 22 percent for teachers with more experience.

Tenure: Nontenured teachers were slightly more likely to involve their students in classroom decisions than tenured teachers. Twenty-five percent of the nontenured teachers involved students while only 17 percent of tenured teachers did. Also, although nontenured teachers comprised only 27 percent of the sample, they made up 36 percent of the teachers who involved students.

Current Position: Full-time teachers are somewhat more likely to involve their students in classroom decisions than teaching chairpersons. Of the full-time teachers, 18.4 percent--compared to 11 percent of chairpersons--involved their students. But there were only nine chairpersons in the sample.

Teaching Time: Those who taught social studies 50 to 75 percent of the time are slightly more likely (24 percent) to involve their students than those who taught more than 75 percent social studies (18 percent).

Degree: Teachers with a bachelor's degree were more likely to involve their students (21 percent) than teachers with master's degrees (14 percent did). Also, bachelor-degree teachers comprised 53 percent of the total sample, but 61 percent of those who involved students.

Professional Organizations: The teachers who belonged to four organizations were much more likely to involve their students in decision making (36 percent) than teachers who were members of fewer organizations (14 to 20 percent of those groups of teachers involved their students). However, since the 36 percent who did involve students amounted to only nine teachers, one must be cautious in interpreting this result.

Professional Journals: There is a clear and strong positive relationship between the number of professional journals teachers read and the extent to which the teachers involve students in decision making. The more journals teachers read the more likely they involved their students. Among the teachers who involved their students in decision making, 57 percent read five or more journals, 33 percent read four, 29 read three, 19 percent read two, 10 percent read one, and 6 percent read none. Also, those who read three or more journals composed only 29 percent of the total sample but nearly half (46.4 percent) of the group who involved students in decision making.

Little or no relationship was found between the extent to which teachers involved their students in classroom decision making and the following variables:

Age

Number of years in present school system

Released time

Salary

Academic major (Only a slight tendency for education majors to involve students more than others was found.)

Inservice training

College credits

Number of professional meetings attended

Use of commercially produced materials

The number of professional journals teachers read was most strongly related to the extent to which teachers said they involved their students in classroom decision making. The more journals read the more likely that teachers would involve their students. It is difficult to hypothesize what caused that relationship. Type of journal (education, social science, and so forth) was not specified in the analysis.

Fairly strong relationships were also found for sex (women said they involved students more) and race (blacks said they involved students much more). Perhaps there is a relationship between the fact that women teachers saw themselves as involved in school decision making and that they involved students more in classroom decisions. Nothing in this set of data points to factors that would explain the surprisingly high level of student involvement by black teachers.

Slight correspondences were found between student involvement and teaching experience (the less experience, the more involvement), tenure (nontenured teachers involved students more), degrees (BA degrees more likely to involve), current position (full-time teachers involved students more than chairpersons), proportion of time teaching social studies (those with 50 to 75 percent time, most involved). Education majors also involved their students slightly more than did social science majors. Also, if teachers belonged to four or more professional organizations, they were much more likely to involve their students in decision making. Except for this last factor, each of the other correlations are the opposite of how these variables were related to teacher awareness. The experienced, tenured, and MA degree teachers were more aware.

Summary

Of the independent variables, sex and tenure appeared to be related to three of the four indices of innovation. In addition, tenure, current position, and highest degree seemed strongly related to both teacher awareness of project materials and teacher participation in decision making, despite the lack of any connection between these two indices of innovation. Number of journals read seemed a significant factor in

how much teachers involved students in classroom decisions and was somewhat related to teacher awareness. The number of college courses taken and professional organizations belonged to were the key variables related to teacher use of innovative practices. Perceived congruence between school practice and teacher practice was a factor in both the level of teacher participation in school decisions and the extent of teacher use of innovative practices. Finally, the amount of released time, salary level, and percentage of commercially published materials used did not correlate with any of the four indices of innovation.

Chapter Three

SOCIAL STUDIES DEPARTMENT AND SCHOOL INNOVATIVENESS

Combining data from both the survey questionnaires and the case studies of nine schools, this chapter discusses the nature of innovation and noninnovation in several social studies departments and high schools. Factors related to the existence of social studies innovation in the departments and schools are also explored.

The first part of the chapter deals with Innovation in Two Small Rural High Schools. Two school profiles are presented. One involves Williams Senior High School--a small Midwestern high school with an innovative social studies department of five teachers. The other school, also in the Midwest, is Flint High School. This three-person social studies department is noninnovative. Then in an effort to identify possible factors related to the innovativeness of Williams and the non-innovativeness of Flint, both schools and departments are compared.

The second part, Innovation in Two Large Urban/Suburban High Schools, focuses on two large high schools in a huge district in the Southeastern section of the country. Again separate profiles of Stephen A. Douglas High School (the innovative social studies department) and Clouds Senior High School (the noninnovative department) are presented before comparing the two schools.

Although broad generalizations and definitive conclusions based on these four case studies are impossible, several tentative hypotheses concerning the factors that foster or inhibit social studies innovation in small and large high schools are discussed.

Innovation in Two Small Rural High Schools

A Profile of Williams Senior High School

by Sr. Georgianna Simon

The Setting

The Community. While there is perhaps no typical Midwestern small city, Williams can be thought of as a variation on that theme.

Located in a rural setting some 150 miles from the nearest large city in its state, some of its 7,200 citizens are housewives, machine operators, laborers, craftsmen, farmers, service workers, and owners or managers. These classifications total 81 percent of the adult labor force. Williams supports a large brick bank, built about 1885, located at the main intersection; a good library (this one newer than the Carnegie era); and 22 churches (21 Protestant, one Catholic). The people are Caucasian. Their income is below that of families in metropolitan areas of the state; but 78 percent of the families own their own well-kept homes. Williams offers a city-owned Olympic-sized swimming pool, four parks, a fishing lake, theaters, a roller rink, pool halls, a driving range, a go-cart track, miniature golf, and two "completely equipped" Little League parks. Among the many organizations in town are: the American Legion and its auxiliary, the AAUW, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Chamber of Commerce, the Jaycees, the Flying Club, the Hospital Auxiliary, the I.O.O.F., the Kiwanis, the Lions, the Rotary, the Masonic Lodge, the National Guard, the Order of the Eastern Star, the Rebeckah Lodge, the Soroptimist Club, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The norm is to graduate from high school (the dropout rate is unusually low) and, if possible, go to college (50 to 55 percent of the high school students attend). Students are motivated to attend college, according to one local observer, by the desire for a higher standard of living than they see about them in Williams. The attractiveness of the community, as they perceive it, persuades many of Williams' college graduates to return home to make a living.

The composition of the population of the community has changed little over time, the citizens identify with the city, and the school system is a source of pride. No bond issue for the schools has ever been lost, and the last bond issue, for $1,300,000, was favorably approved by 89 percent of the voters. The superintendent of schools, with 38 years of service (34 as superintendent), holds a respected and important place in the community, and he enjoys the support of the citizens as well as the school board, whose membership is described as "stable." The city has built a new elementary school and a high school on a large plot of ground at the edge of the city (the land was a gift to the city, this writer

understands), and the new junior high school to be built there may well be named after the present superintendent. Not only does a Christian tradition dominate the community, but there is apparently widespread commitment to it.

The weekly newspaper is devoted largely to local and regional news. The May 21, 1975 issue included items such as the names of the graduating high school seniors, pictures of scholarship winners, a report of hospital admissions and releases, a story on the local contribution to the Alaska pipeline, and a story on poetry written by fifth graders on a visit to a wildlife refuge. The community might be expected to be politically conservative, although there are no data at hand to confirm this conjecture.

The School. The Williams school district developed a building plan in 1943. The elementary school was built first; then the high school was completed, in 1961 (and paid for in the spring of 1969); construction of the junior high will see the original plan completed.

According to the description of the high school written by the superintendent, the primary concern in its design was for the student. The building is divided into areas so that the quieter side of education (classrooms and library) is separated from those educational components that involve more activity and noise (music, physical education, and dramatics). Students are "exposed very little to undesirable weather conditions in changing from one area to another." The offices are located in an area convenient to the student and the library is located in the center of the academic area. On the grounds that the function of the auditorium is primarily to instruct rather than to entertain, the auditorium was designed with the stage as the most important component. The gymnasium design emphasizes instruction rather than interscholastic sports. The second major concern was cost and there is pride that economy was possible without loss of quality (e.g., the present cafeteria is intended to serve the junior high students as well). Finally, the building was designed to be able to accommodate "1,000 or more students" simply by adding classrooms.

Students and Teachers. In the absence of any dress code, except that bare feet and shorts are *verboten*, the students would probably be indistinguishable in dress or behavior from those in any other school with the same social, ethnic, and economic background. The students reflect the homogeneity of both the area and the city, and on this count their range of dress and behavior differed from that of students in a more heterogeneous setting.

The students appear to reflect the community's pride in its schools, and therefore school spirit tends to be strong. Many of the 656 students enrolled (1972 figure) frequently aspired to attend college, *very* often entering Southwestern State Teachers College, located 50 miles away. Others planned on training for vocations and trades.

Procedures of the Visit. Because of an administrative error, one interviewer arrived in Williams a day before the other, assumed that the second was not coming, and conducted interviews with the superintendent, the social sciences department chairperson, and all members of the social studies staff, using the interview schedules and taping the sessions. It was decided that the second interviewer would talk with the superintendent, the principal, the department chairperson, and one faculty member *not* in the social sciences department in order to get a sense of the situation without using the interview schedule. The two interviewers could then compare their perceptions. The session between the two interviewers was conducted just prior to their departure at the local library, and it too was taped. Unfortunately, the tape recorder malfunctioned and some of the taped material was lost. The transcriptions were done without the opportunity to ask the first interviewer for clarification and help in transcribing, and thus the record is not as complete as it could have been. Not all answers to all questions in the schedule are available, and for some questions there are no answers. Nonetheless, considerable information was gained in the process.

The dates of the visit were April 22 and 23, and the second day coincided with a number of examinations.

The Social Studies Curriculum

Courses and Materials. The textbook list indicates the following offered by the social sciences department.

Table 5

Social Studies Course Offerings at Williams

Required Courses

Name	Units Credit	Grade Level
Modern American History	1	9
Modern World History	1/2	10
World Geography	1/2	10

Electives

Name	Units Credit	Grade Level
Consumer Economics	1/2	9-12
Comparative Political Systems	1/2	11-12
Readings in American History	1/2	11-12
Sociology	1/2	11-12
Advanced Sociology	1/2	11-12
International Relations	1/2	11-12
Contemporary Issues	1/2	11-12
State History	1/2	11-12
Psychology	1/2	11-12

Although data from 1970-71 were not obtained, at the time of the visit by the North Central Association in the Spring of 1968, there had been a required citizenship course in the ninth grade that was no longer in the curriculum and American history had been required at the 11th-grade level. Economics was now changed to consumer economics; comparative political systems, readings in American history, advanced sociology, and psychology have since been added.

Interviews revealed that the Fenton materials were used in the required world geography course; comparative political systems employed the Fenton materials of the same name; and the sociology course had

Inquiries in Sociology (SRSS) as the required text.

The faculty of the social science department defined innovation as equivalent to doing something new or different; they saw themselves as early adopters of new curriculum materials; they frequently wrote material to accompany texts; and, in general, they felt free to modify to their own satisfaction any materials provided them. Most would support treating values in their materials, at least to the extent of getting the students to think about the problems involved, and all were relatively satisfied with the present social studies program with minor modifications. The teachers were, however, continually searching for improvement in their instruction with strong support from the superintendent of schools. His view, as recorded by one interviewer, was, "Don't worry about the final product; the important thing is the process of working to improve instruction."

There were no blacks in Williams, and no one could quite say why that should be the case. According to one teacher, the students liked to use the word *nigger*, but it was not permitted in the classroom. One unconfirmed story reported that a black had moved in, but decided to move out again. For a black person, a community of this sort might well be the most difficult in which to gain acceptance. Because there were no blacks, racist attitudes were apparently not counteracted if they existed, and one teacher said, "You shouldn't get involved in this issue as far as telling the kids how to think."

Teaching Practices

In the absence of information about teaching practices that might have been obtained by visits to the classroom, and having little information on this topic generated by the interviews, the data obtained from the questionnaires are the basis for the statements that follow.

A variety of activities are listed on page 8 of the teacher questionnaire (Appendix A). They are: use of nontraditional grading systems, formulation and use of behavioral objectives, combating sexism and racism in the school, use of computer-assisted instruction, use of inquiry or discovery teaching methods, use of individualized instruction, use of community-based learning activities, use of instructional

television, use of student feedback to make changes, participation in human relations training for teachers, and use of values clarification techniques. On a scale of 0 to 3.0 (none, little, moderate, great), the teachers perceived use of these practices as little (N=2) to moderate (N=3). The school was perceived in the same way (in this situation, the school is the district). Of the practices listed, inquiry and discovery methods, student feedback to make changes, and values clarification techniques, in that order, were rated most used by teachers.

In a variety of teaching practices in the classroom in which the students might be involved (Appendix A, Questionnaire for Social Studies Teachers, item 25), the greatest value was 1.4 (on a 0 to 3.0 scale) on evaluating their own work, and the lowest value was .4 on choosing course content. There was little evidence of student decision making. It seems clear that the department as well as the school were concerned with the students' best interests. There was, for example, some interest in the use of alternative programs, ethnic studies materials, and the use of elective courses.

Among the 24 new social studies curricula presented in the teacher questionnaire, the staff were familiar to some extent with 20; ten of those had most often been used "as is." Of the ten used, seven were used consistently by some members of the staff.

Department Interaction

In the last ten years the social science department had two dynamic chairpersons, both of whom were interested in curriculum and in the improvement of the quality of the education in the social sciences. The role that the superintendent of schools played in that situation must not be underestimated. His office was in the building; he was trained in the social sciences; and he was concerned with the continuing improvement of education in the school. Thus, he used his office in both the selection of personnel and the continuing study of developing changes in the secondary school.

Perhaps because of their similarities, the department chairperson and his staff had excellent relations with one another. They were all

below 34 years of age--four were 29 or younger. Most had gone to Southwestern State. All had been at the school for relatively similar periods (one to six years), and most were Williams natives and had all their teaching experience at Williams. All but one were full time and their salaries were comparable. Their formal meetings were frequent (up to six times per year), and were described as both problem solving and information giving. Together they considered problems such as the choice of texts and the total social studies curriculum, and they planned and conducted preschool workshops.

They perceived one another as cooperative and helpful, and they *might* have seen themselves as quite successful, although no hard data are available on this surmise.

Innovation and Decision Making

In the period in which the pace of innovation was at its peak, several constants in the Williams situation were observed. The superintendent was continuing to strive for the best education possible and was enjoying the continuing growth of public support and admiration. He hired principals who shared his views, and the principals in turn found teachers of the same mind. The continuity even extended to having his former principal and his present social studies chairperson go on for further training at the state university.

Such a situation could encourage the use of new curriculum materials, and indeed, the teachers perceived themselves as early adopters (N=3), or early majority adopters (N=2). While all five teachers agreed that they would need approval of "an administrator" in adopting new materials, they expected no one to hinder their efforts and the greatest amount of support would come from that administrator.

The impact of the parents on the teachers was minimal because the superintendent's close situation with the community allowed him to stand between the two parties. The teachers felt secure because they perceived that they and the administrators had a common goal and they felt that they all worked together toward it.

In short, one saw a superintendent who knew where he was going, who had high standards, who made his choices in the light of his objective of excellence, and who found those who could help him and the school achieve those goals.

One or two last observations cannot be resisted. First, the definition of innovation by those in the field need not be profound. In this instance it was equivalent to "doing something new or different." And finally, if one sets one's sails on a course toward excellence, a happy crew can get you there.

A Profile of Flint High School

by Douglas P. Superka

The Setting

Flint High School is located in a small rural school district in one of the Midwestern states. Flint was chosen for a case study visit because previous information indicated that it was a small, non-innovative high school.

Procedures of the Visit. Flint was visited by two investigators for one day in mid-May 1975, four days before the end of the school term. All three social studies teachers, including the department chairperson, were individually interviewed. The two teachers whose primary responsibility was teaching social studies were observed in the classroom, one by both investigators. The superintendent and principal were also interviewed. In addition, the investigators informally talked with a number of other teachers and students. A total of seven hours was spent observing and interviewing in Flint High School. The day concluded in a brief meeting with the three social studies teachers.

The Community. Flint High School is located in a small town, population is 1,193, which is the trading and process center for a large agricultural area. The average-size farm is 596 acres. The majority of the people consider themselves "middle class" and the political climate is conservative. Flint is the county seat and no major industries are found in the area. The majority of the businesses in the town are owned by young people and two-thirds of them have

school-age children or younger.

The community shows support for the school by good attendance at conferences, by passage of the school millage, buying ads for the school calendars and annuals, and so forth. Four local organizations give scholarships to graduating seniors and several local seniors are employed through a new, diversified occupations program for vocational and technical training by local businessmen.

Several school personnel indicated that a few parents and community members have a great influence on the nature and direction of the school. Parental communication with the school is usually in areas such as bus scheduling, individual student schedules, extracurricular activities, and when "specific things go wrong," such as a complaint or misunderstanding about a teacher or activity. In a 1972-73 North Central Evaluation, 57 percent of the parents rated school-parent communication as "fair" or "good." In our interviews, the superintendent said that he communicated with the community primarily through the school board, newspaper, and parent-teacher groups. Both administrators indicated that they felt Flint High School was meeting most of the community needs.

The School. Flint Public School is a large, modern brick building, four blocks from downtown Flint, which puts it on the outskirts of the town. The school contains students from kindergarten through grade 12 in the same building. The elementary section of the building was completed about three or four years ago. The high school section was just completed this past year and, as a result, this is the first year that the high school teachers and students have been in the new building.

The brick, rectangular building is a typical, traditionally designed modern school. Inside, the floors are tile; the spotless walls are either painted white or are composed of orange cinder blocks. Much fluorescent lighting is used.

The general office is near the front entrance of the building. The superintendent, principal, and guidance counselor offices are adjacent to each other near the general office. The high school section is down the right corridor consisting of a couple rooms for social studies, a couple for English, one for science, one or two for math, and the business education room, which contains brand-new desks and typewriters.

The media center (library) is on the other side of the building. The teachers' lounge is somewhere beyond the cafeteria.

The primary school juts out on one wing and the upper elementary on another. The whole school lies on a fairly good-sized piece of land surrounded by fields for playing during recess and for track or football. A parking lot is in front of the building.

Students and Teachers. The students and teachers were a small, homogeneous, white, middle-class group. The faculty and student body were 100 percent white. The junior-senior high school faculty consisted of approximately 20 teachers, about 60 percent male. The average age of the faculty was 30 to 34 years and the average length of teaching experience was 10 to 13 years.

The male teachers seemed to fall into two categories. One consisted of the older teachers, who wore the sportshirt, tie, and slacks-type outfit--no jacket, or at least it was taken off early because it was hot that day. The other group of teachers, about half the male faculty, were attired in bright, solid colored, poloshirts; bright, plaid, flared slacks; and mod-type shoes.

The K-12 student body was approximately 300 to 400 students, the size of the graduating class was less than 50.

The students' dress and general appearance was casual. Generally, a T-shirt, levis and sneakers seemed to be the primary mode of dress for the boys. This varied--a lot of cowboy boots, some sport shirts. Haircuts on the boys were generally short, clean-cropped around the ears; however, some of the boys' haircuts were moderately long. There were almost no really long-haired male students, even though there was no rule against long hair. Most of the girls wore slacks or levis; however, some did wear dresses or pantsuits. The dress code, as it turned out, was very flexible. The teachers said there was no dress code, but after talking with them it seemed as though there was a dress code that outlawed such things as tank shirts on girls and boys.

The general atmosphere at the school was that of a pleasant, very orderly routine. Since this observation day was the last Friday before school closed--it closed the next Wednesday or Thursday--it was amazing that there was so much order and disciplined behavior on the part of

the students. Teachers commented that this was not typical of their day because the kids were kind of loose and undisciplined. But they were amazingly disciplined. For example, at no time during any of the class periods were students wandering in the halls aimlessly, which would normally be the case in this writer's experience, especially at this time of year. The halls were deserted until the bell rang signaling the end of classes; and when the bell rang calling students to their next class, they seemed to move along without lingering.

The relationship between teachers and students seemed to be one of respectful behavior. Students definitely considered teachers their elders and referred to them as "Sir" or "Ma'am." They almost invariably raised their hands during class, rather than just speaking out. The teachers, on the other hand, also seemed to respect the students as students. Generally, the school seemed to operate on a cordial, authoritarian basis. Teachers we talked to and saw seemed to like working with youngsters but their relationship with their students was definitely not on a friendship basis--it was more like father-son, father-daughter type relationship. Teachers claimed that the factor most responsible for creating this kind of relationship between students and teachers was family upbringing--not anything that the teacher had done.

The Social Studies Curriculum

The social studies curriculum consisted of traditional survey courses in civics (9 weeks), state history (9 weeks), United States history, world history, and political science. The following tests were used in these classes:

American Civics, by Hartley, William, Vincent, and William, 1970, Harcourt, Brace & World.

Culture Regions In the Eastern Hemisphere, by Preston, Tattle, Murphy, and Flannery, 1971, D. C. Heath & Company.

History of Our United States: An Interdisciplinary Approach, by Ebling and Larklan, 1969, (publisher not noted; now out of print apparently).

American Government, by Schick and Pfister, 1972, Houghton Mifflin Publishing Company.

The Rise of the American Nation, by Todd and Curti, 1972, Harcourt Brace Johanovich.

Men and Nations, by Mazour and Peoples, 1971, Harcourt Brace Johanovich.

Focus on News (current affairs supplement by Key Publications).

Two of the teachers developed some materials to use in their classes. Usually these were outlines of topics from other books or courses of study. One government course outline, for example, contained the title and number of chapters in the textbook for the entire year so that the students knew exactly what they were responsible for reading each week throughout the course. Attached to the end of the outline was a series of four essay questions. Each essay was due at a specific time during the course of the semester. The final question concerned career education; it asked students to think about what occupation they might want to go into and then explore in depth two or three possibilities by writing letters to personnel managers and getting an interview. The teacher said that, since Flint was such a small town with very few opportunities, this, in a sense, forced the students go to into other larger communities, sometimes as far as 100 miles away.

The level of awareness of the social studies project materials was very low. None of the project materials was used at all and none of the teachers had examined or received instruction in how to use any of the 24 programs listed on the questionnaire. The social studies chairperson indicated that he was aware of 15 of the 24 sets of materials, including sections of Carnegie-Mellon-Holt curriculum, SRSS, and Law in American Society. Another teacher indicated awareness of six sets of materials, including Harvard, Amherst, and four Carnegie-Mellon programs. The other teachers did not know of any.

Although the curriculum objectives as listed in the North Central Evaluation report reflected conceptual, critical thinking, and affective goals, the site observation revealed a different emphasis. The texts used, the structure of courses, and the teaching practices observed focused on teaching the basic historical facts and concepts. The history courses were taught chronologically and the basic goal seemed to be to get up to the 1940s, '50s, and '60s. One teacher criticized

the U. S. history text he was using because at certain places it was organized topically rather than chronologically.

The chairperson said that four or five years ago the social studies program was basically the same as currently, with perhaps a few different textbooks.

Teaching Practices

The physical setup and instructional activities were traditional in form and content. The social studies rooms generally were well lighted and very neat and clean. The following description of the department chairperson's room characterizes the physical setting for the social studies classes.

The room was well lighted with fluorescent lights. The front of the room contained a brown chalkboard, and on either side were two bulletin boards. These were filled with pictures of the frontier, Indians, pioneers, a state map, and a calendar. There was a very tall garbage can in the front. On the other side of the chalkboard was a music stand that the teacher used as a lectern. His desk was right in front of the chalkboard. The spotless walls were white and windowless, plastered, except for one orange cinder block wall with two windows at the end of each side.

There was a magazine rack containing 1970-73 issues of *Current History*. The students had colorful metal chairs--blue, red, and yellow--six chairs in each of five rows neatly aligned facing the front of the class. There were three standing maps near the orange wall, open to the Pacific Area--World War II and Europe--World War II.

On other side, opposite the orange wall, there were some bookcases containing old textbooks--French books (he also taught a French class) and U.S. government books which had been collected from outgoing seniors. A set of old golf clubs and a machine used to line off the chalk marks for a track meet were also along that wall. The front of the room also contained a screen that could be pulled down for audiovisual purposes.

Lecture-discussion and question-answer methods were used most extensively. There was very little indication of frequent use of role playing, individualized instruction, or inquiry techniques. Generally,

the focus of the instruction observed was on low-level thinking and teacher-directed questioning. The following are descriptions of the activities of the two full-time social studies teachers. First is the department chairperson teaching a world history class of seventh- and ninth-grade students.

The teacher started by asking if there were any questions about the previous day's work, which was apparently on Europe between World War I and World War II. There were a couple questions, one about the Bloc Nationale. Another student reported that he had read in the library about what happened to the World War II bunkers. He had found that they did go up for public sale.

Then the teacher explained that he was going to give them sone information that would serve as an overview of world history from 1920 through 1975. Next week he would go into greater depth on certain topics. He proceeded to lecture in college-professor style for approximately 20 minutes on the rise of Mussolini and Hitler. Mussolini born so-and-so, died so-and-so, rose to fame, and so forth. He described his rise to power and Hitler's rise to power. His jokes were very similar to college-type jokes and many of them seemed to go over the heads of these students.

Most of the students dutifully took their notes on everything that was said. No one talked. Students had their books out on their desks, opened up to the chapter dealing with Mussolini and Hitler, and were writing down the key facts that the teacher was presenting. Every now and then there were a few questions from students, which would be answered quickly. Every now and then the teacher would put key words on the board as he talked. Those words included: Gestapo, fascism coming from the Latin word "fasces," Black Shirts, *Mein Kampf*, putsch, concordat, Nazis, Vatican City.

Suddenly a student said, "You know, I think Hitler was pretty smart to kill those Jews because this created less starvation and ultimately better people would be living." The quiet, responsive note-taking activity was suddenly interrupted. The teacher immediately responded that *Mein Kampf* was a pack of lies and that the Germans were not the pure race. Then he tried to summarize the statement by saying,

"Everybody had a right to live and nobody had a right to declare who should live and who shouldn't live." The same student asked if there was such a thing as a Black Jew and the teacher attempted to answer. Then another student answered, "Well, didn't it depend upon whether you considered Jewishness a religion or a culture?" This discussion lasted for several minutes. Then the teacher proceeded to cover the chronological events of World War II and beyond: the outbreak, 1939 through Pearl Harbor, V-E and V-J Day, Berlin, the Bamboo Curtain, the Korean War, U-2, Cuba--the invasion and the missile crisis, Diem's assassination, Tonkin Gulf, and the Vietnam War. He finished at 2:25 and then asked if there were any questions, at which time a student asked a question about Mussolini. During the lecture the teacher usually leaned on the chalkboard and did not move. At 2:25, however, five minutes before the class was over, he did move to the front of his desk and sit relaxed. As the students were waiting for things to end, he said, "Here's some dates to remember: December 7, 1941, a day that will live in infamy; September 14th, or V-J day." Here he explained the controversy about whether it was the 14th or the 2nd. He went on to relate: "1950 to '53 was the general period for the Korean War; '63 - '73 was the general time period for the Vietnam War." And then the bell rang. The students stayed where they were until the teacher said, "The first two rows dismissed," and the students got up and walked out. A few seconds later he said, "The last three rows," and the other students got up and walked out. Several students asked some questions at his desk and that was the end of the class.

The second observation was in an eighth-grade local and state history class. The teacher began by reading aloud a list of the salaries of public officials in the state. For example, "County clerk, $12,500; attorney general, $22,500; secretary of treasury, $17,000." The students dutifully and diligently took notes on every salary of every official. Some even raised their hands and said, "What was that? $20,000 what?" They seemed to respond immediately to doing that task and not questioning it. This activity lasted for approximately ten minutes. Then the teacher lectured on the local court system and civil and criminal law, with frequent interruptions for questions and answers.

From 11:25 until about 11:28 he described the schedule for the week. From 11:28 until 11:35 he had the students write down ten questions that they thought would be on the test, which they immediately did. From 11:35 until 11:45 he broke up the students' work and had a little current discussion, which will be described later. Then, at 11:45, he let them go to lunch, so that they would get there before the high school students.

Now to elaborate more on the kinds of activities that went on in the classroom. As was stated, the teacher started out by lecturing the kids on the salaries of the various state officials, then indicated that some of this would be on the test next week. It was discovered that in the previous class the teacher actually used these salaries to discuss the reasons someone would earn more money than another. He apparently felt that there was no time to cover this in the class before lunch because of the shortened period.

The teacher walked around, asking questions and oftentimes answering his own questions but still attempting to intersperse questions and answers within a straight lecture.

He seemed to have a benevolent-authoritarian relationship with his students. He addressed students formally: "Miss Walton," "Mr. Chappaquiddick," "Yes Ma'am," "Sir." Sometimes the students responded in the same way, "Yes sir." Considering that the classroom was hot and stuffy, the students responded amazingly well to the question-and-answer session on civil and criminal law. He gave some examples that would relate to the students' real world, such as speeding in a car (at least this would be the case in a few years) or being involved in juvenile or civil court cases. Whenever he indicated that notes were to be taken, students went right to the task without question.

After about ten minutes working on their questions, the teacher asked if anybody had heard about the Mayaguez. This started a very lively discussion on the recent events in Cambodia. The students showed good knowledge of what had happened in the Cambodian situation and then related this to the Pueblo incident. At this point the teacher had them recall previous facts from the Pueblo incident and

compare and contrast the facts of the two situations. The teacher asked higher-level cognitive questions, such as "What would you do if. . .," "What's good about that?," or "How does this compare to that?"

Department Interaction

The social studies department consisted of three teachers. Two had full-time social studies teaching duties and one taught only one social studies course while specializing in music.

The social studies chairperson was in his early 40s and had 15 to 16 years teaching experience, the last nine years of which were at Flint High School. He was a real history buff (a member of state historical society and with his own library at home). He owned a farm near Flint and was very active in the community (e.g., as a Little League coach) and in other school functions (e.g., track coach, student awards). The other full-time social studies teacher was in his late 20s, had about eight years of teaching experience, the last five of which were at Flint. The music/history teacher was 27 years old and in his second year of teaching.

There was no social studies budget. Social studies teachers, like the others, could request funds for new materials.

Formal department meetings were not held. Nearly all meetings among the social studies teachers were informal and unscheduled. Each teacher seemed very autonomous. There was little observation of each other's classes or exchange of ideas. The two teachers asked the chairperson questions about history and teaching because they respected his talent and experience as a social studies teacher.

The chairperson viewed his role primarily as receiver of the department mail, most of which was quickly discarded. The need for strong social studies leadership was not felt in this small school.

Most information processing and griping and discussion sessions occurred in full staff meetings scheduled every Friday morning. These meetings were conducted by the superintendent and included all teachers, K-12.

Innovation and Decision Making

The superintendent and principal both viewed their roles as supportive of efforts to innovate, but not necessarily as initiative of change. The function seemed reserved to the teachers and the school board. Several teachers, including the social studies teachers, felt that the superintendent was the real power behind the school and the key element in any significant innovation and decision-making efforts.

Two specific innovations were characterized as having originated from teacher efforts. A new learning disability program was begun by the efforts of one female teacher and had the enthusiastic support of the superintendent. It was generally considered very successful. Also, a "floating schedule," whereby one class period each day was dropped, was also initiated by several teacher suggestions. The principal said that since that new schedule did not work well, the school would be returning to the old seven-period schedule next year.

Teachers and students were not formally involved in decision making and both groups seemed satisfied with that situation. All three social studies teachers indicated a low degree of teacher participation in decisions in areas such as budget, curriculum program, and hiring teachers and administrators. Two of the three teachers were satisfied with this situation. They believed that they had moderate power to decide which curriculum materials to use.

The social studies teachers did not agree on the level of student involvement in decision making. One indicated that the school did little to encourage it but that he provided for student involvement, such as evaluating teachers and choosing activities, to a moderate extent in his classroom. Another said that the school encouraged student participation to great extent in dress codes and behavior. The third teacher rated the school's and his own provision for student decision making as little.

Generally, the decision-making structure was benevolently authoritarian. All involved seemed generally satisfied that the structure was probably the best setup for this type of community.

Summary and Conclusions

Flint High School is a very small, traditional school in a very conservative, traditional rural area. Great innovations are seen as unnecessary to satisfy the stable, conservative desires and needs of the community. The social studies teachers and the curriculum reflect this lack of change. They seem content with a curriculum consisting of the basic U.S. history, government, civics, and world history structure, focusing on chronological fact-and-concept surveys. Teachers have little contact with current trends in education--professional education journals are not read and colleges are far away. Since the administrators, teachers and students seem happy with the current program, very little change is likely to occur anyway.

A Comparison of Williams and Flint

by Douglas P. Superka

From the profiles, it is evident that Williams and Flint high schools are similar in various respects. Each is a small school in a rural Midwestern setting isolated from any large cities. The communities are typical Middle-American (white, Anglo, Protestant) and politically conservative (according to the teachers). Both communities also consistently support the schools financially, as evidenced by the passage of all recent bond issues and by the presence of new buildings for both the elementary and secondary levels. The average ages of the faculties are the same and the average years teaching experience are close (seven to nine and ten to 13 years). Total racial homogeneity exists at both schools, as all teachers and students are white. Both high schools have under 20 persons on the professional staff, but the Williams student body is over twice as large as that of Flint. Thus the class size of Williams is somewhat larger (24 to 18, approximately).

Various differences between Williams and Flint are evident. Impressions from the site visits and data from the questionnaires confirm that Williams is more innovative than Flint. Williams offered social science courses such as sociology and psychology as well as international relations and contemporary issues in addition to the basic social studies courses (U.S. history, political science, and geography).

Moreover, some of the social studies project materials were used in these courses, whereas Flint used traditional textbooks entirely. Although observations were not made of Williams teachers, the observers (one of whom visited both schools) concluded that the social studies teachers at Williams would probably have used inquiry teaching, values clarification, and other innovative practices more than those at Flint, where they were virtually nonexistent.

The social studies department scores on three of the four indices of innovation support the conclusion that Williams is an innovative school compared to Flint. As summarized below, Williams scored much higher on awareness of social studies project materials and participation in school decision making.*

Table 6

Comparison of Williams and Flint on Four Indices of Innovation

	Awareness	Decision Making	Innovative Practices	Student Involvement
Williams	3.40	3.00	1.60	1.60
Flint	2.00	1.67	1.33	2.33

The innovative practices score is also higher for Williams but only slightly (1.60 and 1.33). Moreover, both scores indicate little or no use of innovative practices. The small size may be responsible for the low scores on this index. The other seven schools in the sample, each of which was larger, all scored higher on this measure than Williams and Flint. Since some of the 15 innovative practices were items such as computer-assisted instruction, individualized instruction, and instructional television, which are more characteristic of large schools, this might explain the low scores for the two small high schools. An examination of social studies department scores

*These figures reflect recoded values as described in Chapter 2.

on three other innovative practices reveals a noticeable difference between the self-ratings of Williams and Flint teachers.*

Table 7

Comparison of Williams and Flint on Four Innovative Practices

	Inquiry Teaching	Values Clarification	Community-based Activities
Williams	3.00	1.80	1.40
Flint	1.33	.67	.33

By contrast, the social studies teachers at Flint High School score much higher than the Williams teacher on the degree to which they involve their students in classroom decision making. This is a puzzling finding since nothing was perceived by the site visitors to support Flint's high score. Perhaps the teachers in both schools involved students only slightly on some absolute scale, but the Flint teachers viewed this as more significant than the Williams teachers. One Flint teacher, for example, marked that he let students evaluate his teaching to a "moderate" extent. When interviewed he explained that this meant he distributed an evaluation form to students at the end of each year, but he did not think he would have time to do it that year. Perhaps the Williams teachers interpreted such a provision involving students "a little." There is no specific evidence to indicate that, however.

Another indication of the innovativeness of Williams is that all five social studies teachers were among the high-index group of teachers who participated in school decision making and two of the five were in the high-index group of teachers who were aware of the project materials. None of the Flint teachers were in either of these groups.**

---

*These values are actual raw scores on a scale from 0.00 to 3.00.

**None of the teachers in either school were in the high-index group of users of innovative practices. Size of the school has already been suggested as a possible reason for this.

Finally, the perceptions of the respective principals support the conclusion that Williams is more innovative than Flint. The Williams principal stated that his social studies teachers were "early adopters," while the Flint principal observed that his were in the "late majority."*

Clearly, by both observation and questionnaire results, Williams was found to be an innovative school with an innovative social studies department and Flint was found to be a noninnovative school with a noninnovative social studies department. What were other clear differences between the two schools that might help explain why Williams was more innovative?

An examination of teacher and superintendent data revealed at least six distinct differences but no evidence was found to indicate that the teachers or superintendents, individually or collectively, were responsible for the differences in innovation. Four differences related to the social studies teachers. First, the Williams teachers were uniformly younger (all were under 34) while the Flint teachers were composed of one teacher in his 20s, one in his 30s, and one in his 40s. Perhaps, the members of the young Williams social studies department reinforced and helped each other's tendencies toward innovation. Second, the Williams social studies department also had frequent formal meetings, in contrast to the Flint teachers. This might have provided a helpful mechanism or structure to facilitate communication. Third, each social studies teacher at Williams attended at least four professional organization meetings in the last three years, while none of the Flint teachers attended any meetings. Finally, while both department chairpersons were thoroughly respected by their social studies colleagues, the Williams chairperson was much more similar to his fellow teachers than the Flint department head. Behavioral research has indicated that models who are respected are much more effective if they are perceived to be similar to the persons who are to be changed. Perhaps a similar process helped to foster innovation at Williams.

There are two other obvious differences, related to the superintendent. While both had a similar type of authority and felt they

---

*"Innovators" and "laggards" are the extreme groups with the "early majority" being middle group.

supported innovation, the Williams superintendent had been a respected community leader for over 30 years while the Flint superintendent had only been in the district for about five years. This, coupled with the fact that the Williams superintendent initiated efforts to improve the education of key members of his staff (e.g., by encouraging his principal and social studies chairperson to take further training) while the Flint superintendent did not, may have provided the combination of top level support and grass roots initiative needed to develop an innovative social studies department and program.

Perceived responsiveness to new ideas on the part of various elements in the school was also different between Flint and Williams. The superintendent, principal, and social studies teachers of Williams consistently and congruently rated each other as responsive to new ideas to "some" or a "large" extent. For example, the superintendent, principal, and social studies teachers all agreed that the social studies department was very responsive to new ideas. Each of those persons also agreed that the principal was responsive to new ideas to some extent. Self-ratings were similar or identical to the ratings of others.

The ratings of those same elements at Flint were consistently lower than those of Williams. Moreover, while there was congruence in terms of the social studies department (all agreed it was responsive to "some" extent), there was none in the rating of the principal. While he saw himself as responsive to new ideas to a "large extent," the social studies teachers perceived him as responsive to *less than* "some" extent, while the superintendent ranked him responsive to a "slight" extent. (See Figure 1.)

Table 8

Williams and Flint Results: To What Extent is/are the [superintendent, principal, social studies teachers] in your school or district responsive to new ideas?

Ratings of Social Studies Department		Rated by:
Flint	Williams	
2.00	3.00	social studies teachers
2.00	3.00	principal
2.00	3.00	superintendent

Ratings of the Principal		Rated by:
Flint	Williams	
1.67	2.20	social studies teachers
3.00	2.00	principal
1.00	3.00	superintendent

Ratings of the Superintendent		Rated by:
Flint	Williams	
2.33	2.20	social studies teachers
3.00	2.00	principal
3.00	3.00	superintendent

0 = no extent

1 = slight extent

2 = some extent

3 = large extent

Thus, while there appears to be a smooth link of responsiveness at Williams from top administrator to the social studies teacher, there is a perceived break in that link at Flint. The observations and interviews at Flint confirmed that situation. Teachers repeatedly stated that, if they wanted to institute any change, they went to the superintendent, not the principal.

In conclusion, while Flint and Williams shared many common characteristics such as the nature of the physical setting and local community, composition of the student body, and per capita income, they differed on other significant factors, such as the age of the social studies teachers, the interaction among them, the tenure of the superintendent, and the perceived responsiveness of the principal to new ideas. A combination of these different factors may be partly responsible for the empirically demonstrated differences in educational innovation in the two high schools.

Innovation in Two Large Suburban High Schools

A Note on This Sample of Two Schools

Stephen A. Douglas and Clouds Senior High School were selected for examination here because they represented the most innovative and most noninnovative of the seven social studies departments surveyed and visited, although they are in the same district. It was decided to control for within-district variance by focusing on two schools in the same district rather than one in each of the two large districts in our study.

Thirteen of the 14 social studies teachers at Clouds completed the questionnaires. The one omission was not judged to affect the results significantly. A more serious problem occurred with Douglas High School. Only ten of the 17 social studies teachers completed the questionnaires. Did these ten teachers represent a cross-section of the department, especially in terms of innovative versus traditional orientations? Since Douglas was clearly the most innovative school, we decided to keep it in the sample if we could get some positive answer to that question. We asked an independent judge, not associated with

the school or district, but knowledgeable concerning the Douglas social studies faculty, to rate the innovativeness of all the teachers in the department. Then, checking this against our coded list of respondents we found that the ten represented a cross-section, skewed slightly and surprisingly to the noninnovative side. Deciding that this alleviated the problem we kept Douglas in the sample. The slight skew toward noninnovative teachers might explain why the data are not as clearcut as might be expected. The judge also confirmed that Douglas was indeed the most innovative social studies department in the district.

A Profile of Stephen A. Douglas High School

by James B. Watson

The Setting

The Community. Stephen A. Douglas High School, located in the town of Landstake, has an enrollment of around 3,000 students, of which an estimated 30 percent are black. No figures are available on the proportion of Orientals or students of Cuban origin; however there seem to be a small number of Cubans in the school. In addition to ethnic composition, the student body also reflects several other community characteristics. The school draws a small but significant number of its students from the service families of an air base nearby. It also draws a significant number of students from considerable distances--allegedly up to 40 miles or more. This last fact is reflected in an extensive busing program, largely removing the commuter element of the student population from intensive--or perhaps any--participation in extracurricular activities of the school and possibly from a certain kind of identification or "school spirit."

The changing character of the Landstake area provides other significant background information about the school. Predominantly rural for many years, it was homesteaded by the ancestors of part of the present population. Suburban expansion of a nearby city is now reaching the area, perhaps partly due to new freeways. A growing proportion of the student population is urban oriented and from middle- and upper-middle class socioeconomic backgrounds.

Stephen A. Douglas was integrated only in the last decade (1967) when a segregated high school serving the black population of the area was closed. This development was closely followed, in 1968, by a race riot in the school--the first in any high school of the county-wide school district. Following the crisis, there was a change in administration and direction at Stephen A. Douglas, which brought about a policy strongly favoring scholastic adjustment and adaptation to avoid further strife.

Douglas serves a rather diverse, probably little-integrated population, some of whom identify little with the district or the school: they are too remote; too transient (like the military); too newly arrived in the area (like the ex-urbanites); or like the old, rural-oriented freehold element (too few or too estranged) to continue to regard Douglas as "their" school--if ever in the past they did. Cutting across the foregoing gradients of space and length of residence are the ethnic cleavages--white, black, and Cuban, the juxtaposition of the three in a single institution in a matter of a scant decade or so.

The investigators learned little of the political climate of the area except that it "had gone for Wallace" in the 1972 presidential primaries.

A low public profile could describe the relation of Douglas and its wider constituency. It seems that the least possible (or most general) accountability is demanded of this school by the area it serves. On the positive side, this means little or no surveillance and interference by the general public. Negatively, it means, to certain teachers and administrators at least, almost no response about any of their programs or planning endeavors. Some have reported a "deafening silence" from the community about plans for taking the school to the community through activities such as open houses, forums, coffee hours, workshops, and demonstrations.

To hazard a guess beyond what has already been noted of the character of the district, the laissez-faire climate of the public toward the school may also arise from the fact that Douglas is only one of a number of high schools administered within the same, large, county-wide

school district. Its own distinctiveness, or potential for being distinct, is perhaps not well known or credible, especially to a population who are little unified and who have a small common ground.

The School. The school consists of a set of low buildings, sitting on a flat site, among groves of pine and casuarina and areas of rank grass. The school buildings--spread out around covered, open-air, cement-paved corridors--enclose several interior courts open to the sky and floored with mown grass. With a parking lot on one side and playing fields on the other, the buildings have no particular charm or grace. They are constructed with concrete or cement-block material that reflects the minimal, utilitarian approach of communities like Landstake to furnishing communal institutions. The classrooms and offices are cell-like, with few windows that most often open on to corridors. The predominantly bare concrete walls give the impression that what matters, if anything, is the activity within. Light-colored walls are accented with green-painted or dark-stained wood trim and areas fit for grubby hands or kicking. Cement classrooms and common rooms, much like those of a factory, are relieved by simple furniture and a smattering of posters, bulletin boards, chalkboards, progress charts, cupboards, and shelves used for housing instructional materials.

Students and Teachers. Douglas students, from brief observation, were dressed casually, seemingly reflecting a lenient or lightly enforced dress code. Some girls wore halters with bare midriffs. Tight pants seemed nearly uniform. Many blacks had Afros or cornrows. Generally, the student body was well scrubbed and cleanly clad. The many pleasant and smiling faces among them influenced the impression about the whole group.

Student comportment, judging from corridors and several classrooms visited, was neither highly disciplined nor boisterous. Very little rough-and-tumble behavior was observed, and, the amount of loud talking, bumping, and ambling about were probably well within the middle or low range of American public school behavior.

Overt ethnic identity, to the casual observer, was visible mainly in the separate clusters of blacks and whites in corridors and to some extent in the seating choices in at least some classrooms visited. On

the day of the survey, a contingent of black students staged a classroom boycott, apparently over what was considered to be an insufficient balance of black representation on the cheerleader squad. Joined by a number of white students, this demonstration reportedly led to a peaceful airing of views, and matters seemed headed for tolerable resolution.

School spirit at Douglas was evident only intermittently and not uniformly throughout the student body. Reasons for this have been suggested in the previous discussion about the community.

Academic and occupational goals of the Douglas students--to judge from the programs offered at Douglas and from the community itself--were quite diverse. There were students of whom an assistant principal said it was gratifying merely that they attend at all because there was little reward for any achievement they could either manage or find personally meaningful. At the other end of the student spectrum were the college-bound students who considered their high school years in the "prep" program as scholastic training rather than self-discovery, lifemanship, and citizenship. A small, individually paced, and motivated learning program has existed since the early '70s, serving another contingent of students. This program has a predominantly scholastic flavor. An art teacher said some of her students could not lay off a line into fixed segments such as quarter-inches, while others learned this in the primary grades. So there were those whose active appetites must be fed with all they can learn and those who must, if possible, learn to learn.

The social studies teaching staff of Douglas was about two-thirds male and over half of those reporting were under 30 years of age. Two were between 30 and 40 and two over 49 years of age. No figures were available about the ethnic or racial composition of the social studies faculty, but observation suggested it was preponderantly white. At least one black teacher and one black apprentice teacher were noted, and one social studies teacher had a Spanish surname. About half the social studies teachers reporting had three years or less of teaching experience; three teachers had between four and six years experience; and only two teachers' experience exceeded 14 years. Four of the ten reporting social studies teachers were in their first year at Douglas and four-fifths of them had been there six or fewer years.

Only one reporting social studies teacher had taken in excess of 17 social studies-related college credits in the last three years and the majority had taken 12 or fewer college credits. While three of the ten teachers reported that they regularly read four professional journals, the majority reported reading a maximum of two journals. Two teachers reported reading only one social studies journal, and two reported reading no professional journals at all.

One social studies teacher reported no membership in any professional social studies organizations; four reported membership in one such organization; four, in two; and one teacher reported membership in four professional social studies organizations. Attendance at meetings of professional social studies organizations in the last three years was not high. Among the reporting teachers, four attended no meetings; one attended one meeting in the three years; two reported attending three meetings; one teacher attended five; and one attended nine or more meetings.

Comparisons would be necessary to demonstrate whether the social studies faculty of Douglas was relatively more isolated than others from contact with current social studies developments through college courses, professional journals, or attendance at meetings. But the reports do not suggest intensive involvement in national or regional activities of their profession. On the other hand, as those reporting were such a youthful group, it is possible that many were still working with the ideas and orientations they had only lately received at college.

The Site Survey. Douglas was visited on the morning of Thursday, May 22, 1975, by a team of three observers. Seven interviews were conducted using the schedules (Appendix A), each with a teacher who had received and completed a questionnaire sent out before the school visit. An additional five or six unscheduled conversations were held with students and faculty. The site visit lasted three to four hours, with most of the time being used for interviews and class observations. Some six or seven social studies classes were observed for at least a part of a period, and an exhibit of student art and craft work was visited by one observer, who held several informal conversations with

faculty members who were monitoring the exhibit. The library and cafeteria were also visited. Other than the fact that it was nearly the end of the academic year, there was apparently nothing unusual about the timing of the visit.

The Social Studies Curriculum

Courses and Materials. The curriculum was organized on a "quinmester" plan--five terms per year, each of nine weeks' duration. Social studies offerings were determined in three main ways. First, the state required two social studies courses: consumer education and a course about "Americanism vs. Communism." The title of the latter was more standardized than its content seemed to be. A second group of social studies courses existed because of tradition and perhaps because they were entrance requirements for certain colleges and universities. Some of the American history courses seemed to fit into this group. A third type of course arose primarily out of the special interest or competence of the local faculty. Initiation of courses in this category seemed substantial and active. Examples of these courses were found under rubrics that suggested traditional courses. Perhaps responsible for these fresh courses was the new administration brought in after the race riots in 1968. This administration was given a free hand to innovate and, apparently, beyond indicating that innovation was necessary or desirable, passed on much of its license to the departments. In the case of the social studies department, it was the observers' impression that the license was passed on in turn to the individual teachers. Some interviews indicated that innovation was best promoted by recruiting faculty who could be expected to be innovative. The short quinmester units seemed to have the effect of multiplying courses and opening the way for creating new ones, some of which were created by one or two faculty members.

Some 78 courses in social studies at the senior high school level were listed by the school district, in addition to 43 courses in social studies at the junior high school level. This number probably did not include courses being created or take into account the fact that different instructors may make different courses out of the "same"

course title. The curriculum was grouped into five categories: general social studies, American studies, world studies, political and economic studies (with a subgroup for each), and behavioral studies. The context of some of the categories is more obvious than that of others, the first and last perhaps being the most ambiguous. For instance, "Futuristics" came under general social studies, while "Getting Your Act Together" came under behavioral studies. "Race Relations Around the World," perhaps for obvious reasons, was a world studies course, while "Alternatives to Violence" was again, behavioral.

The courses were not leveled or phased and were, for the most part, nonsequential. Students had many courses to choose from and they were advised to consult with their parents, guidance counselor, and teachers when deciding which choices will best meet their "individual needs and interests." A minimum of eight social studies courses was required by the district in senior high, of which four had to be in American history or American government. Not all of the prescribed American studies courses were truly traditiona. For example, "American Values" contained broad, self-discovery, awareness-raising exercises.

The mandated course, "Americanism vs. Communism," and the legislative requirement for a course in free enterprise and consumer education constituted the only explicit constraints external to the district school system. There seemed to be little constraint in the curriculum inventory and social studies requirements by the county-wide school district.

The basic objectives of the social studies as stated in the district's printed brochure were: "to aid students in better understanding man in his social and physical environment," and "to help the student to become a better decision-maker through understanding himself and the world around him."

The budget for the social studies department appeared to be sufficient--perhaps even generous. $3,000 was mentioned as the budget for a recent year, in addition to an option of negotiating increases if needed. Purchase of equipment such as projectors was

not included in the budget. The department chairperson believed the department was in good financial shape.

The ten respondents to the Social Studies Teacher Questionnaire (Appendix A) knew of the 24 materials listed in question #28. Eleven of the 24 products were unknown to between over one-fourth of the reporting faculty; ten more were unknown to over one-half; and two were unknown to at least 75 percent of the reporting faculty. Half of the 24 products had not been demonstrated to any reporting social studies faculty, and the reporting faculty had been instructed in only one or two of the 24 materials.

Use of the products by the reporting social studies faculty was less frequent than knowledge of them. Nineteen of the 24 products had never been used by over 75 percent of the reporting faculty and five products had never been used by one-half to three-quarters of the group. The product used by more reporting faculty than any other was an Asian studies unit; however, it had not been used by between one-fourth and one-half of the group. Only one out of the 24 curriculum products had been used in any form or degree by as many as one-half of the reporting faculty. Seven of the 24 products had been used intensively, by less than a quarter of the reporting faculty--usually by one or two persons.

Twenty of the 24 products were reported as having never been used by three-quarters or more of the respondents. The remaining four products were used by half or more of them. Only half of the products were reported to have been used "consistently" by any reporting faculty member. Three of the ten respondents reported using none of the products.

One could probably infer from the results that, whatever social studies innovation there may have been at Douglas, there was little adaptation or use of nationally developed curriculum products. (Of course, the failure to use such products does not imply lack of innovativeness, necessarily.) Budget limitations did not seem to be the reason for little knowledge and use of these curriculum products.

The Curriculum Four to Five Years Ago. Unfortunately little information was available about the curriculum four to five years ago. Reading between the lines of the available reports, it seemed that there

had been considerable change at Douglas due to administrative policy changes since the race riots of 1968. Little could be provided for a base against which to measure changes in the past several years. Thus, the innovativeness of Stephen A. Douglas High School might be assessed by the comparison of the Douglas curriculum with the meaning of innovation in today's world. The two team members most knowledgeable about recent innovation believed Douglas' social studies program was not strikingly modern in content, form, or style.

Teaching Practices

Most Douglas social studies teachers reported that some provision was made for alternative programs, although one-third of the respondents saw this provision as slight and over one-fifth regarded it as negligible. Opinions as to how much differentiated staffing was employed varied surprisingly, perhaps reflecting the individual's own experience. The largest number of respondents considered the use of differentiated staffing only slight, and the next largest proportion considered it negligible. As to ethnic studies, of which representative courses were listed in the district's social studies brochure, only slightly more than half of the respondents agreed that the course constituted an ample response to this need. A substantial majority agreed that ample social science electives were offered. Just under half considered that the use of open space at Douglas was moderate. Opinions about nongraded classes were quite widely scattered. The largest group of respondents considered this development slight, although one-third of them rated it greater than that.

Respondents showed a considerable lack of knowledge about district policy concerning the series of 12 innovative practices. In only one case, nongraded teaching systems, did a substantial majority of the respondents profess to know district policy. All of the respondents rated themselves as "greatly" committed to "combatting sexism and racism in the school," and over 75 percent considered Douglas to be greatly committed, also. However, over half gave the district a moderate rating. In a majority of cases, more respondents considered their own commitment to an innovation as equal to or

(more often) greater than that of the school. The three exceptions were computer-based learning (slight edge to school), behavioral objectives, and team teaching.

Combining the respondents' lack of knowledge about district policy concerning the 12 innovations with the predominant impression of faculty members that they were ahead of the school, one might find some collateral support for the suggestion previously noted that innovations at Douglas are initiated by the teachers. Instructional decisions at Douglas seemed to be a laissez-faire phenomenon in which the teacher was given a fairly free rein.

Among the innovative items to which social studies faculty at Douglas ranked themselves as greatly committed, the modal respondent indicated six of the 12. The six items were: combatting sexism and racism in the school, inquiry and discovery teaching methods, individualized instruction, instructional TV, use of student feedback, and values clarification techniques. The school itself was also ranked as quite strongly committed to each of these six practices, although in all cases less strongly than the individual respondent.

Impressions gathered during two or three hours on a single day are perhaps not sufficient enough to judge teaching practices. However, from our brief observation it seemed that there were: excellent traditionalist-type teaching; informally run classes; and classes in which student-gathered materials were used. Social studies classes seemed to display a wide range of teaching styles: individually paced study programs, group projects, individual projects, high-standard scholastic programs, basic skills programs, traditional and informal arrangement of classroom furniture, and efforts to draw out students. Overall, social studies at Douglas was somewhat innovative.

According to one observer's viewpoint, innovation at Douglas had more to do with course design--content, orientation, emphasis, and goals--than with the management of classes; the arrangement of furniture; the use of chalkboards, hardware, and books; and so forth. The logistics and arrangements in the culture simulation course reported to us, however, would be termed innovative. (It was not in progress at the time of the visit--nor was any course in anthropology, although the

Douglas faculty boasted four faculty knowledgeable about anthropology.) In this class, student went outside and, using only local resources, constructed a culture presumed to be viable in this landscape.

The women studies course was represented to the three visitors as an innovative curriculum item. Women studies was in the district's brochure for social studies and therefore, could not be considered Douglas' innovation per se. The innovativeness of this Douglas course must have been, therefore, in the content and orientation given the course by the two women teachers who collaborated in developing it.

From the materials observed as well as others described to us, it was clear that both imagination and dedication were shown in the work of various Douglas social studies teachers. Yet there is no evidence of any overall thrust toward newness or experimentation other than what individual teachers were able and wished to do in individual courses and classrooms. Or, perhaps fairer to this school, with its diverse student body and diverse public (and probably its diverse faculty), newness or experiment tended to take the form of diversification, the very form that would preclude the development of any focused, across-the-board, *integrated* innovative program. Thus, to look for school-wide evidence of social studies innovation would seem unpromising here. What one could probably find was what the three visitors seemed to find in the course of their few hours at Douglas: a kind of local-option arrangement in which individual instructors were at liberty to deal with their respective individual spheres--all within the same general and quite loose format that the district's policies prescribed.

Department Interaction

Meetings were held, it appeared, about once a "quin" (nine weeks) or less often. They did not seem to serve the purpose of conceiving or implementing modifications and innovations in programs but primarily seemed to be a forum to conduct business. As much as possible the department chairperson communicated whatever information he had to his staff by memoranda. It may well be that would be innovators dealt with him more than with each other.

The chairperson seemed to view and to enact his role in a basically supportive and permissive way, encouraging individual teachers to proceed with plans they brought him, even when, as he said, he sometimes did not personally like the proposal. Once or twice he indicated he could "slap wrists" when he had to; however, the overall impression received by the visitors was not of a punitive, authoritative, or "hard-nosed" administrator, nor of a chairperson who was responsible to no one. Individual faculty interviewees found themselves generally supported and free to carry on in any reasonable way, novel or not. The chairperson appeared to be more the overseer than the commander. He was certainly not aloof.

Among the social studies teachers, there seemed to be a fairly low level of factionalism; a healthy amount of tolerance for each other's rights to develop courses suited to their own interests and styles; a limited amount of team-type cooperation such as that between the two teachers who designed the women studies course; and, perhaps, interaction confined largely to working hours and the school premises. These opinions are offered with little evidence, however.

Innovation and Decision Making

The observers received signals indicating that in the social studies department, if not in all of Douglas, teachers were relatively free to determine curriculum. This freedom was apparent with respect to setting budgets, recruiting, and other business.

The reporting social studies faculty modally ranked teacher participation in curriculum decision making as "moderate" on a four-point scale of "none," "little," "moderate," "great." However, an equal number of reporting faculty--roughly one-third each--indicated "little," "moderate," and "great," suggesting that experience varied markedly or perhaps that some waited to be consulted while others did not. On selection of curriculum material, opinion ranked actual teacher participation in decision making substantially higher, with a modal opinion of "great," the topmost rank allowed. Still, 60 percent of those reporting differed--20 percent ranking teacher participation as "none," another 20 percent "little," and 20 percent as only "moderate."

Again, the reporting social studies faculty were not unanimous with regard to the extent of teacher participation, even in selecting curricular material.

Regarding the regulation of student attendance and discipline, the modal ranking dropped once more to "little" actual teacher participation. No one ranked it "great," but 40 percent considered it "moderate." On hiring new teachers, the modal response was no actual teacher participation. Only one respondent saw participation as "little." All indicated no participation by teachers in hiring new administrators. On teacher participation in making budget decisions, 80 percent of the respondents considered it "none." One person--10 percent--ranked it as "little," and one as "moderate."

Forty percent of the responding social studies faculty--the modal response--considered formal student involvement in the choice of their learning activities as "great." The remaining majority of responses were equally divided among the three lower ranks. These results might have been influenced by the elective system of course selection, which is, on paper at least, quite broad--also by the existence of some courses in which student input could have been considerable but seemed to be undeveloped.

As to the student choice of course content, opinion was widely scattered--almost a perfect spread of the range from "none" to "great." Here again one might surmise the presence of ambiguity, for some respondents might be mindful of the seemingly generous formal provisions interviewees several times noted for student involvement, while other respondents might have felt that the small use made by students of existing provisions was a mark against their adequacy. Most respondents felt students were involved in their own evaluation and were nearly as much involved in evaluating their teachers, but were less involved in evaluating fellow students.

Respondents' average ranking of teacher involvement in decisions, on a scale of 0.0 to 3.0, was .930; the mode of averages was one and no average exceeded 2.10. Their average rankings of actual teacher decisions, on the same scale, was 2.2, with a mode of two. While these two readings might seem contradictory, they may not be if one

recalls that the first figure reflects the different spheres in which teachers had some or no involvement while the second figure reflects the weight of their decision-making activity in those spheres in which they were involved.

One example of innovation at Douglas was illustrated in the design of new curriculum units, such as the culture simulation course in ecology or the women studies course. Another example of innovation was the introduction of subjects, like anthropology, that are less traditional in the social studies inventory than others. A third example of innovation concerned practices such as nongraded teaching systems, the use of special hardware and of open space, and the development of individualized instruction.

Summary and Conclusions

The observers did not feel that the somewhat innovative program at Douglas was noteworthy by some absolute standard of innovation. As compared to past programs at the school, however, it represented marked change. The absence of any inservice training for change could indicate that social studies innovation was supported by the system but not instituted or directed by it.

"Grass-roots innovation" can be taken as a fairly accurate description of social studies at Douglas. Individual teacher initiative has been mentioned a number of times throughout this sketch. The slight use of nationally distributed curriculum products has also been noted; and the prominence of home-made study materials compared, say, to textbooks, was suggested to the visitors by their brief observations. Surely such a cluster of individual and institutional patterns might impede a more centralized approach to social studies change were one to be instituted.

A Profile of Clouds Senior High School

by Geneva Gay

The Setting

Clouds Senior High School is located in the same county-wide district as Douglas. Clouds was targeted for site visits because the district in which it is located had a national reputation for being innovative. The school was visited in mid-May 1975 for the purposes of interviewing teachers and administrators and observing classroom practices concerning social studies curriculum materials and instructional strategies in use. Three observers spent a total of six hours each visiting classes and talking to teachers, administrators, and students. They interviewed six different teachers, the social studies department head, and the school principal. They also observed six different social studies classes on a variety of topics including law and society, tradition and change, anthropology, psychology, sociology, American politics, and Americanism vs. Communism.

The school is located in a residential area that has gone through a racial transition in the last ten years, due to the influx of black and Cuban residents. The student population is approximately 2,200 to 2,500. The student body includes Anglos, blacks and Cubans. The percentage of minority students is about 20 to 30 percent, which is almost evenly distributed between blacks and Cubans. The students come from middle-class backgrounds (the average is somewhat on the lower spectrum of that scale), and their dress and attitudes are typical of students in many contemporary middle-class high schools. They dress casually (Levis are almost like uniforms), avoid extremes in both dress and grooming, appear to be somewhat apathetic and disinterested in academic studies, are less than enthusiastic about school in general, and place great pride in school athletics, especially the football team. There appears to be at least surface congeniality among the different ethnic groups, perhaps arrived at through noninterference with each other.

The school is housed in a physical plant built in the late 1940s or early 1950s. The structural components of the building reflect the school architectural designs of that period. It is built around a square

design, and is composed of several wings interspersed with open air courtyards.

The social studies department in this school is composed of 14 teachers, of which two are females and 12 are males. There is only one black member of the social studies faculty. Eighty-five percent of the teachers fall within the age range of 25 to 48. Most of the teachers received their college educations at institutions within the state. At least 38 percent hold a master's degree, and several have done graduate work beyond the bachelor's degree. A great deal of stability prevails among the social studies teachers at Clouds High School, as is evident by the fact that the average tenure is eight to ten years. Over 30 percent have taught one to six years at the same school, while the remaining 69.2 percent have taught at Clouds for seven to 13 years.

The Social Studies Curriculum

The social studies curriculum at Clouds High School is organized around a series of nine-week courses called quinmesters. The quinmester structure was designed and instituted by the school district about five years ago as a means of responding to student demands for relevance, variety, and flexibility in their educational experiences. The "quins" are developed by the local schools from guidelines provided by the county district. Usually two or three quins are required to complete a course. However, there are some courses lasting a single quin. Multiple quins in a single course are not necessarily sequentially ordered.

Instead of traditional social studies courses like world history, American history, and American government, the quinmesters allow for greater diversity. Clouds offers students quins in such topics as the boom and the crash, advanced placement American history, tradition and change, law and society, black studies, seminars in social studies techniques, the history of law, and Americanism vs. Communism. More course offerings in the behavioral sciences like anthropology, sociology, psychology, and economics have become available since institution of the quinmesters. Although the quins are not designed for homogeneous grouping, they provide for a kind of modified ability grouping in that some

have emerged as "tough courses for capable students," while others have developed reputations as being easy.

The teachers expressed some dissatisfaction with the quinmester organizational structure. Their displeasure stems from what they consider as the failure of this structure to provide enough scope and sequence, and comprehensiveness to the social studies, and to give attention to fundamental skill development in the core courses, or "basics." These would include American history and American government. Those teachers who teach courses which presume prior comprehension of basic social studies concepts and factual content are hampered in their efforts because the students lack these referential orientations. The time they spend doing "remedial tasks" to instruct students in basic social studies knowledge interferes with teaching the advanced or specialized courses the way they should be taught. For example, the history of law instructor indicated that that course presumed the students possessed knowledge of certain historical concepts. When it was discovered that they did not, he had to teach those concepts before he could begin to teach about the history of law. To proceed otherwise would have been unproductive or even counterproductive.

The teachers readily admitted that the quinmester structure provided variety. Seventy-five percent estimated that the school provided a moderate amount of alternative programming for students. Undoubtedly, most of this was attributable to the quinmesters. They also felt that this structure had served a needed purpose in responding to student demands of the late 1960s and early 1970s. But, now that those demands and pressures had abated, it was time to get back to the "real stuff" of the social studies. Those teachers interviewed would prefer to trade less variety in course types for more depth in analysis. They felt substance was sacrificed for diversity, and that students were being shortchanged in the long run. There was also a feeling among the faculty that students, except on rare occasions, were not receiving instruction in the kind of social studies skills and knowledge essential for success in college. They attributed this to the time and sequence restrictions imposed upon them by the quinmesters.

The curriculum materials used most frequently and most persistently by the Clouds High School social studies teachers fell into the category of textbooks. It was true that some teachers used paperbacks in lieu of a single text, and most others, on occasion, used "quickready materials" such as xerox copies of newspaper and magazine articles, and excerpts from other resources. The textbook was still the primary source of the curriculum, however. Upon further examination it became apparent that most of these books were at least ten to 15 years old. Social studies books, both texts and paperbacks, which were written during or prior to the 1950s, and were very popular then, were in great abundance at Clouds High. Browsing in the bookroom revealed such titles as *The Rise of the American Nation, Process of American Government, Age of FDR, Faces That Shaped American History, Age of Reform, American Foreign Policy Since World War II,* and *Only Yesterday.*

Teachers teaching similar courses were not required to use identical texts. Rather, they were free to make their own choices as to what they wished to use. Most of these were chosen from lists of state-adopted materials. The result was that while great variety existed among the social studies faculty as to which texts were used, there was little variation in the types of materials since they were all basically textbooks. There was little evidence that these teachers were even familiar with the wide range of social studies project materials that had been produced over the last ten years. When asked about these materials on the questionnaire mailed to the teachers prior to the site visit, the social studies faculty responded overwhelmingly that they were not familiar with the materials. An average of 70 to 75 percent of the teachers answered, "never heard of them," to all of the 24 social studies curriculum project materials identified. This observation was reaffirmed in the on-site interviews. Of the six teachers interviewed, only one indicated having ever used any of the national project materials. She had used *Tradition and Change in Four Societies* produced by Holt, Rinehart and Winston. None of these materials were present in the bookroom, where all social studies materials were stored. These observations seem to indicate that the social studies teachers at Clouds High School were content to use more traditional textbook-oriented curriculum

materials, and to depend upon their own ingenuity to provide some variety in these materials, instead of using national project materials.

Teaching Practices

The traditionalism evident in the curriculum materials used by the Clouds High social studies teachers also characterized their classroom practices and instructional strategies. For the most part, classes were teacher-centered and teacher-directed, and most instruction took place within the context of lecture-discussions. This was first apparent from the physical layout of the classrooms. All classrooms were arranged in a classical format--six chairs arranged in six rows, with a teacher's desk and podium placed center front. Teachers, when guiding learning, usually functioned from somewhere near the front of the room. Their approaches to classroom interaction were very directive and convergent, in that they initiated almost all verbal interactions with students and directed questions toward particular students instead of presenting them to the entire class. Also, student responses were directed primarily to the teacher instead of to each other.

Some variety existed from class to class, and, undoubtedly, mirrored the personalities and philosophies of the individual teachers. Interviews and on-site observations revealed that some teachers used different techniques, such as role playing, individualized instruction, field experiences, and high-level questioning from time to time. However, these appeared to be exceptions to the rule, reserved for "special occasions," and seemed to result more from intuitive feelings than from professional training, preplanning, and perceiving them as integral components of the instructional process.

The observers' impressions and interviews corroborated the teachers' questionnaire responses that few nontraditional social studies instructional strategies were practiced at Clouds High School. Approximately 54 percent of all social studies teachers reported not using any nontraditional grading techniques; 77 percent used individualized instruction infrequently; virtually no team teaching

had been used by 84.6 percent; and 60 percent indicated that they used no or very little values clarification in their classrooms. All of the six teachers interviewed said they used inquiry in their teaching. They varied widely in their responses to questions about the use of behavioral objectives and values clarification. One of the six interviewees said he would use behavioral objectives if he knew what they were. Some gave no responses at all, and one said she considered behavioral objectives very important because they helped in assessing students' levels of academic achievement and in evaluating the adequacy of instructional plans.

Social studies teachers at Clouds were somewhat reluctant to deal with values in their classes, or to even discuss the question of the role and function of values clarification in the curriculum. Their comments ranged from, "the classroom is no place for values," to "teachers should be models for students," to "societal values should be taught," to "values are secondary to knowledge," and "schools need to address academic issues rather than being bothered with human relations." These reactions indicate ambivalence about values teaching, and a lack of real understanding as to what values clarification is all about. When asked about such specific issues as racism and sexism, most of the teachers felt there were no racial problems at Clouds, and they tended to confuse "sexism" with "sexual behavior." Whether these responses stemmed from genuine confusion about the meaning of these issues, or were ways of evading the issue, it was quite evident that racism and sexism received little attention in the social studies curriculum.

Similar to the situation with curriculum materials, there were some individual teachers at Clouds who used some novel approaches to teaching. For example, one teacher was observed improvising a role-playing exercise. Another explained that he used contract grading in his advanced seminars, and community-based research experiences, wherein students, individually or in small groups, spent time collecting data from community-based resources, synthesized these data into summary reports and conceptual designs, and shared them with the rest of the class. These techniques were sporadic and individually initiated, and did not extend beyond the given classroom to become institutionalized departmental practices. Generally, the teachers were very traditional in both their curriculum

designs and instructional methodologies, focusing primarily on mastery of facts and expository teaching.

Departmental Interactions

A great deal of classroom and individual autonomy prevailed among the teachers at Clouds. Teachers had almost total freedom to decide what curriculum materials and instructional techniques to use in their classrooms. They seemed very happy with these arrangements and used them at their own discretion. This allowed for much variety from one classroom to another.

The teachers in the social studies department were very cordial to each other and cooperative on an informal, unstructured basis. They shared materials, resources, speakers, and sample tests with each other. But they had not formalized these interactions into any kind of organized departmental structure. The fact is, they were rather isolationist when it came to formal classroom practices. Each one went about doing what he or she deemed most appropriate and effective for classroom instruction. No attempt was made to pool talents and work cooperatively to complement each other's instructional styles.

Departmental meetings were held monthly; however, they were most frequently devoted to dispensing information on procedural matters instead of discussing substantive issues. Rarely did they deal with questions of teachers' problem solving, enhancement of staff members' professional development, and curriculum design or modification. If there was a need for these issues to be addressed, it was done most often through subgroups or committees composed of individuals who expressed personal interest in the particular issue. For example, at the time of the site visit some members of the department who were particularly concerned about the absence of basic social studies courses and fundamental skills teaching in the quinmester structure were meeting to discuss some alternatives or ways of revising the quins to accommodate their needs. For the most part teachers felt department meetings were of little value, except perhaps as a medium through which dicta from "on high" (high level administrators) were delivered to them. One faculty member summarized his evaluation of the value of department meetings with this comment: "If I think I might have to be absent any

day of the week I try to choose Tuesdays because that's when staff meetings are held." Another member remarked, "Teachers are preoccupied with keeping their jobs," implying that any ideas or activities that suggest other purposes or might be considered somewhat controversial by some are not likely to be received very enthusiastically by most teachers.

Consensus of opinion prevailed among the Clouds High social studies teachers that their department head was a nonaggressive, nice, congenial person, who was easy to work with. They also agreed that he was basically passive, somewhat complacent, very cautious, and tended to shy away from providing strong leadership. He was not quick to make decisions; nor was he an initiator. What innovation occurred was initiated at the individual-teacher and classroom level. Yet, he would go along with good suggestions, was supportive of his faculty, would not stand in the way of anything they wanted to do. One of his colleagues described him thusly: "He's an easy-going, even-tempered person, who is not too demanding." Another observed that "he gets more accomplished with less resentment by being passive and democratic." A third said, "He'll support you in what you want to do but he is not an initiator or a pacesetter." The faculty seemed quite happy with the low profile, nonthreatening leadership the chairperson provided and agreed that, while he was not a strong leader, he was a nice guy who did not interfere with his faculty.

The informal cordiality the faculty members had for their chairperson also extended to each other. Almost without exception they described each other as "nice people." But, some expressed mild concerns with what they considered a lack of commitment to and enthusiasm with their jobs expressed by some of their colleagues. They felt too many teachers were not interested in developing any real sense of professionalism. Nor were many of them receptive to new ideas and to trying out new instructional strategies. Rather, they seemed content with the status quo. To some extent these observations were validated by the on-site interviews. When asked if they read any professional journals on a regular basis, attended professional meetings, or were aware of new trends, materials and developments in the social studies, teachers repeatedly responded negatively. Only two could readily give

the name of a professional journal they had read recently.

Decision Making

Beyond their own classrooms and the department, social studies teachers at Clouds High School had little decision-making powers. They rarely participated in personnel decisions regarding hiring and firing of teachers, or curriculum decisions about what should constitute the social studies program. Most of their involvement in these domains was very informal. Decisions concerning personnel were made by the school principal and the administrators at the central offices of the school district. The department chairperson was sometimes called in to consult with the principal when vacancies occurred in the department, and he was advised about administrative decisions. Teachers were almost totally uninvolved in these processes.

Both on-site interviews and questionnaire responses substantiated this point. Over 83 percent of the teachers indicated in their questionnaires that they received little or no encouragement to participate in hiring other teachers, and 75 percent said they were not involved at all with budget decisions. Teachers were involved in the curriculum decision making process to a somewhat greater degree. Eighty-two percent of the teachers responding to the questionnaire said they were encouraged to participate in making decisions about curriculum program changes, while 67 percent said they actually participated. The area where the greatest amount of teacher involvement in the decision making process occurred was the selection of curriculum materials. Only 8.3 percent of the teachers reported that they did not choose their own curriculum materials. Undoubtedly, the involvement here was heightened by the fact that neither the department head nor the school principal interfered with teachers' selecting their own materials and instructional strategies, as long as the curriculum mandates of the school district were honored. These indicated only what structural constructs (i.e., quinmesters) should be used. The state also mandated one course (Americanism vs. Communism) that must be taught. Decisions regarding how these were to be implemented fell within the purview of the social studies department and the individual classroom teachers.

Students were even less involved in the decision-making processes than were the teachers. On a school-wide basis, determining dress codes and other behavioral standards were where student involvement was most pronounced. Eighty-three percent of the teachers reported students had moderate to great influence over dress codes and other behavioral matters. The least amount of student involvement in decision making occurred in matters related to teacher evaluation and curriculum. At least one-third of the teachers indicated that students in the school did not make decisions about curriculum. Fifty percent of the social studies teachers said students were not involved in teacher evaluations at all, while 41.7 percent said they were to a small degree. Further examination of this revealed that the students at Clouds High were primarily responsible for developing and disseminating a teacher evaluation instrument. It was produced over the opposition of the assistant principal, who served as the curriculum officer for the school. Teachers participated in this evaluation on a volunteer basis. Obviously, there were some teachers who chose not to participate in the evaluations, as was evident by the fact that 30.8 percent said students were involved in teacher evaluations in their classrooms, and another 46.2 percent said, "Yes, but only to a very small extent."

Student involvement in decision making within individual classrooms reflected patterns similar to those for the school at large. Nearly half of the teachers (46.2 percent) said students did not evaluate each other in their classes. At least half of them report that students were rarely involved in choosing course content and learning activities or making decisions about classroom management and teacher evaluation. The percentages are 61.6, 77.0, 61.6, and 77.0 respectively. These data suggest that, for the most part, students at Clouds High School were not involved in making decisions on substantive matters regarding the directions of their educational experiences.

Social studies teachers at Clouds High School considered their principal to be very receptive and responsive to innovative ideas. They attributed this to the fact that, while he may not have been a strong initiator himself, he was not an inhibitor of change or progressive ideas; he was open-minded and willing to listen; he left his teachers

alone and gave them freedom to do what they wished; and he was supportive of new ideas if teachers could demonstrate that they were well thought out and well planned. On occasion he had initiated seminars for the benefit of teachers. These were on contemporary educational issues, such as educational funding, behavioral objectives for individualized instruction, and administrative practices. He also helped to organize a citizens group to lobby before the state legislature on behalf of increased funding for education.

Comparatively, the assistant principal, who was the curriculum administrator for the school, was viewed with much skepticism. The teachers considered her to be extremely conservative, bound by tradition and the status quo. She was opposed to progressive ideas and, in their estimation, was unwilling to make decisions that would help others to implement such ideas. They felt that, if there was something they wanted to do, rather than go to the curriculum officer, it was more expedient to go directly to the principal.

Although the teachers readily admitted that they had rather limited decision-making powers beyond their classrooms, they seemed to be quite content with this arrangement. The attitude prevailed that, "things could be better, but, as long as no one is dictating to me what I must do in my classes, I can live with it." And, there was little question that they did have a great deal of latitude in the classroom. As a matter of fact, the administrative structure at Clouds High School was such that there were clearly discernable domains of power, and these were rarely transgressed. Each division (i.e., classroom teacher, department head, principal, student) seemed to have arrived at a decision as to what its roles and functions were, and went about doing only that, without any real attempts to extend the prerogatives of that position to anyone else.

Summary

The teachers, administrators, and students at Clouds High School were quite traditionally oriented. This was apparent in course designs, materials selection, instructional strategies, and leadership styles. Admittedly, there were individual exceptions to this general profile. But, these exceptions occurred not so much from planned change

or professional preparation as from intuitive actions and individual personalities. Few teachers at Clouds were aware of new trends and materials in social studies instruction. Many were unfamiliar with such techniques as values clarification, inquiry, and behavioral objectives.

The school appeared to be bound by custom and tradition. There was a striking absence of any overt signs of innovation, diversification of students' interests, teaching materials and learning styles, student and teacher enthusiasm about schooling, and variety in the total school climate. The prevailing, governing principles seemed to be "conformity and complacency, and let's return to the glorious days of the 1950s." When asked, "What is the single most innovative change your school has experienced within the last few years?", the teachers agreed unanimously that it was the quinmester system.

Although some teachers resented the quinmester's imposition upon them (by mandate of the district), and were quick to detail its weaknesses, this structural change was still seen as an effective response to the pressures of the 1960s for relevance and greater variety in the curriculum. It provided flexibility while keeping the school from exploding under the press of desegregation, student protests, and the exacting demands of life in the 1970s. Now that the storm had passed, many Cloudians were anxious to return to the bygone days when basic courses in social studies (American history, world history, and American government), mastery of factual information, and "rigorous academics" reigned supreme. Without a doubt, traditionalism already existed at Clouds High School. And, there were some forces at work that would have liked to see it perfected.

A Comparison of Stephen A. Douglas and Clouds

by Douglas F. Superka

Since these two schools are located in the same district they share many common characteristics. The physical settings, geographic area, socioeconomic level, and political climate are very similar. In addition, both schools underwent a racial transition within the last ten years and, as a result, the racial-ethnic composition of the community and student body has changed. Once predominately white, the schools are now

30 percent minority--mostly black and Cuban. The schools are also similar in size, having between 2,500 to 3,000 students and 100 to 150 teachers. Even the physical structure of the buildings are the same--old-style bungelows with grass courtyards.

There were also various commonalities between the social studies programs and faculties of Clouds and Stephen A. Douglas. The structure of the social studies curriculum was similar. Both schools offered a variety of courses, including social science electives, organized into quinmesters (nine-week courses). The types of courses offered did not differ significantly between Clouds and Douglas. Since the direction for this organization came from the district office, all the high schools in the county had this curriculum structure.

The sizes of the social studies faculties were similar (Clouds = 17; Douglas = 14). Both faculties consisted largely of white males with from one to three blacks and females.* In addition, 77 percent of the faculty in both social studies departments had either history or social science as academic majors.

The interaction among the department members was also similar. The social studies teachers in both schools were fundamentally autonomous; although they shared resources, they did not work in teams to any substantial degree. Department meetings were held regularly and were mostly information-giving rather than problem-solving sessions. The chairpersons of both departments were white males over 45 years old with over 17 years experience in the school system. Each also acted as a benevolent, even permissive, overseer rather than a stern authoritarian. Each seemed to be well liked and respected by colleagues. While neither initiated change or policy, both were supportive of the efforts of their teachers.

Finally, there was no substantial difference between the two social studies faculties' ratings concerning the responsiveness to new ideas

---

*Clouds had one female out of 13 social studies teachers while Douglas had three females out of nine (one did not mark that item).

of various elements (superintendent, principal, etc.) in their district and school. A four-point scale was used (ranging from 0 = no extent to 3 = large extent). Each principal was seen to be responsive "to some extent" while their respective curriculum administrators were responsive less than "to some extent." Each department rated themselves as responsive from "some" to a "great" extent. Each department saw their common superintendent as responsive to less than some extent.

Despite all these similarities, there were various differences between Clouds and Stephen A. Douglas. The statistical data and the on-site observations of the investigators support the judgment that Stephen A. Douglas was somewhat, but not greatly, more innovative than Clouds.

The Douglas social studies teachers, as indicated below, scored somewhat higher than the Clouds teachers on three of the four indices of innovation.

Table 9

Comparison of Douglas and Clouds on Four Indices of Innovation*

	Awareness	Decision Making	Innovative Practices	Student Involvement
Douglas	2.60	2.20	2.50	3.10
Clouds	2.00	2.15	1.77	2.15

*These are recoded values.

Thus, while the Douglas social studies teachers said they used innovative practices and involved students in classroom decision making to a moderate extent, the Clouds teachers did so to only a little extent. The Douglas teachers were also slightly more aware of the social studies project materials. An examination of the responses to specific innovative practices showed that the two departments differed the most in the use of instructional television, community-based learning activities, values clarification strategies, and participation in human relations training. Although Douglas scored much higher than Clouds in these above areas, they scored only somewhat higher on combating racism and sexism and using student feedback to make changes. Very slight differences, again favoring Douglas, were found for use of

computer-assisted instruction, behavioral objectives, nontraditional grading, inquiry teaching, individualized instruction, and team teaching.

Table 10

Comparison of Douglas and Clouds on Specific Innovative Practices

	Douglas	Clouds	Difference
Use of nontraditional grading systems	1.55	1.23	.32
Formulation and use of behavioral objectives	2.11	1.84	.27
Combating sexism and racism in the school	3.00	2.15	.85
Use of computer-assisted instruction	.77	.53	.24
Use of inquiry or discovery teaching methods	2.11	1.69	.42
Use of individualized instruction	2.22	1.84	.38
Use of community-based learning activities	1.89	.84	1.05
Use of instructional television	2.22	.46	1.76
Use of student feedback to make changes	2.88	2.15	.73
Participation in human relations training for teachers	2.11	.92	1.19
Use of values clarification techniques	2.00	.80	1.20

Scale: 0 = none, 1 = little, 2 = moderate, 3 = great extent. These are actual raw scores ranging from 0.00 to 3.00 and were derived from averaging the teacher responses of each school.

The clearest difference in student involvement was student evaluation of teachers. The Douglas teachers did that to a moderate or great extent (2.30), while the Clouds teachers did so to only a little extent (1.00).

Another indication of the differences in the level of innovation between Douglas and Clouds is the proportion of social studies teachers each school had in the high-index group on two of the four indices. Sixty percent of the Douglas teachers were in the group that used innovative practices compared to only 30 percent of the Clouds teachers. In addition, 50 percent of the Clouds social studies department involved students in classroom decision making while only 22 percent of the Clouds faculty did. The percentages of high-index teachers in awareness and teacher decision making differed only slightly.

The moderate difference in the level of innovation at the two schools was supported both by the outside observers and the social studies faculty itself. While a mixture of innovative and traditional ideas and practices were seen at Douglas, predominately traditional activities (only a few cases of innovative strategies) were seen at Clouds.

Department chairpersons and the department's rating of itself in terms of innovation support the conclusion that Douglas was a more innovative school than Clouds. When asked to classify the Douglas social studies department as innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, or laggards, the chairperson said that they were "innovators." The social studies teachers' own rating agreed--"innovators or early majority." The Clouds chairperson, on the other hand, categorized his department as early majority, a judgment agreed to by the Clouds teachers on their self-rating.

Thus, while the social studies departments of the Clouds and Stephen A. Douglas share many characteristics (including being in the same district), they do seem to differ visibly on several measures of educational innovation. The social studies department and program of Douglas was somewhat more innovative than that of Clouds. Why? They do differ on several key factors that might help answer that question.

Although Stephen A. Douglas High School does appear on several statistical measures to be a more innovative school than Clouds, the difference is neither striking nor substantial. In terms of the use of 12 innovative practices schoolwide, the social studies departments of Clouds and Douglas rated their respective schools as using them to a

little extent (Clouds = 1.03) and between a little and moderate (Douglas = 1.36). On the existence of various innovative programs in the schools, the rating by the social studies teachers were also not very different. Only in the use of open space was there any substantial difference. Thus, the existence or lack of a pervasive school climate of innovative activity cannot explain the existence of more social studies innovation at Stephen A. Douglas than at Clouds.

Table 11

Comparison of Douglas and Clouds on Innovation Programs

	Douglas	Clouds	Difference
Provision for alternative programs	2.00	1.54	.46
Use of differentiated staffing	1.50	.69	.81
Inclusion of ethnic studies materials, courses, or programs	2.20	1.69	.51
Inclusive of social science electives such as anthropology, sociology, or psychology	2.50	2.77	.27
Use of open space	1.80	.62	1.18
Nongraded classes (students from various grade levels in the same class)	1.50	1.46	.04

Scale: 1 = slight, 2 = some, 3 = large extent. These are raw scores from 0.00 to 3.00 and were derived by averaging the teacher scores for each school.

Several factors related to the respective social studies faculties may help to explain the difference in innovativeness. Age of the social studies teachers was one such factor. The average age of the Douglas social studies teachers was 31, while that of Clouds was 37. In addition, 60 percent of the Douglas social studies teachers were under 30 years of age compared to only 15 percent of the Clouds department. Amount of teaching experience also differed substantially. The average number of years experience for the Douglas department was four and one-half while that of Clouds was eight.

Also, nearly 70 percent of the Clouds department had over ten years experience compared to only 20 percent of the Douglas social studies department.

The Douglas social studies teachers also read more professional journals than did the Clouds teachers, though the practice was not extensive at either school. Thirty percent of the Douglas teachers (three of ten) read four or more journals regularly while only 15 percent of the Clouds faculty did. From another viewpoint, only 20 percent of the Douglas teachers read no journals compared to nearly half (47 percent) of the Clouds teachers.

The Clouds teachers also stayed away from professional meetings more than the Douglas teachers. Nearly 70 percent of the Clouds teachers attended no meetings in the last three years, while only 40 percent of the Douglas social studies faculty were nonattenders. The Clouds social studies department also had more tenured teachers (84 percent to 50 percent) and teachers with master's degrees or beyond (38.5 percent to 22 percent).

All of these factors (age, teaching experience, professional journals read, and meetings attended) except the last two (tenure and degree) were consistent with the findings of teacher innovativeness. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that these factors are related to the innovativeness of Douglas and lack of innovativeness of Clouds. Since nontenured teachers were found to have high scores on three of the four indices of innovation, the tenure difference is also consistent. The fact that the less innovative school contained more social studies teachers with master's degrees conflicts with the teacher innovativeness results related to awareness of materials but is consistent with those for involvement of students in classroom decision making.

Since only two schools were considered, one should not generalize that these factors are related to social studies department innovation in high school. A study of a larger number of social studies departments in many districts would be needed to confirm or reject these findings. However, these case studies do support various assumptions and hypotheses relating specific behavioral and structural dimensions to social studies innovativeness.

In spite of the differences between Stephen A. Douglas High School and Clouds Senior High School that relate to social studies innovation, there is no way of knowing whether these differences cause the differences in innovation or merely accompany them. Probably the single most significant factor explaining the innovativeness of Douglas relates to the race riot that occurred shortly after the school was integrated. A new principal was brought in who specifically attempted to help solve the racial conflicts by recruiting innovative social studies teachers. This principal is no longer at the school (the responsiveness rating referred to previously relates to another person) but, from working closely with the department chairpersons, the principal's leadership still had a pervasive effect on the social studies program at Douglas.

Conclusion

One theme which persists in the two cases (large and small) of innovative schools is the importance of the leadership of the principal and department chairperson to social studies innovation. In the case of the small schools, the superintendent can supersede the principal in direct impact of the level of innovation in the school.

In the two schools where the principal and/or superintendent was committed to and a leader in innovation (Williams and Douglas), the social studies program and teachers were innovative. In the two schools where this was not the case (Flint and Clouds), there was a noticeable lack of social studies innovation. Moreover, in all cases, the department chairpersons, who were all capable teachers, seemed to fit into the existing situation of either traditionalism or innovation. At Williams and Douglas he helped facilitate change and innovation, while at Clouds and Flint he helped to maintain the status quo.

It is difficult to eliminate circularity in dealing with innovation. Are differences in schools, departments, and programs the results or the causes of innovation? In general, several factors seem to support one another. For example, if one wanted to go about developing or obtaining an innovative social studies program or

faculty, this study would indicate that it would help to look for young teachers but not totally inexperienced ones, and teachers with master's degrees who read several journals and were active in several organizations. According to this study, such a focus should increase the likelihood of achieving an innovative social studies program and faculty.

The following chart summarizes some of the findings concerning the four high schools and social studies departments described in the previous profiles.

A SUMMARY OF THE SCHOOL PROFILE RESULTS

	Non-Innovative Social Studies Dept.		Innovative Social Studies Dept.	
	Flint	Clouds	Williams	Douglas
Indicators of Innovation				
Moderate or high:				
Awareness of the Social Studies Project Materials			X	
Teacher Participation in School Decision Making			X	
Teacher Use of Innovative Practices				X
Involvement of Students in Classroom Decision Making	X			X
Factors Related to Innovation				
Younger social studies teachers			X	X
Less experienced social studies teachers			X	X
30% or more of social studies teachers read four or more professional journals regularly				X
Over 1/2 of social studies teachers attend a professional meeting during the last three years			X	X
Social studies dept. conducts regular meetings		X	X	X

A SUMMARY OF THE SCHOOL PROFILE RESULTS (continued)

	Non-Innovative Social Studies Dept.		Innovative Social Studies Dept.	
	Flint	Clouds	Williams	Douglas
Teachers perceive superintendent as responsive to new ideas to some extent		X	X	X
Teachers perceive principal as responsive to new ideas to some extent		X	X	X
Teachers perceive themselves as "early adopters" or "innovators"			X	X

Chapter Four

DISTRICT INNOVATIVENESS

This chapter explores the nature and possible causes of district-wide social studies innovativeness and noninnovativeness. Two large, urban/suburban districts in the Southeast are considered: Diamond County, a sprawling, innovative district composed of more thar 20 high schools, and Opal County, a large district containing 12 high schools. Rather than presenting separate profiles, the two districts are immediately compared in areas such as physical setting, political climate, socioeconomic level, district administration, social studies program, and faculty.

A Comparison of Opal and Diamond County School Districts

Opal County and Diamond County are two large school districts located in the same Southeastern state. Both districts sprawl into both urban and suburban areas, with the latter even extending into rural regions. The latter encompasses one of the largest cities in that section of the country. Both districts employ over 3,000 high school teachers. While Opal County has 12 high schools, Diamond has over 20. The students and teachers are predominately white with about 15 to 25 percent black and Spanish speaking.

The socioeconomic levels of both districts are similar. Based on per capita income, Diamond County is somewhat wealthier than Opal--$3,467 to $3,038. (In our random sample of 96 districts, Diamond was 26th and Opal 52nd.)

Based on observations during the site visit, the political climate is more conservative in Opal than in Diamond, but the latter still did not seem to be liberal. Both areas are heavily Democratic, if the political affiliations of the majority of the school board members is any indication.

The school boards of Opal and Diamond counties are similar in other respects, also.* Both are elected and are dominated by whites, largely male. Both feel that they could use more money and believe that teachers should not go on strike. Significant differences between the two boards also exist. By a two-to-one margin, the Diamond school board believes that teachers should not have a greater share in decision making. The Diamond board members also perceives more citizen interest in the schools than do the Opal board members. Finally, more members of the Diamond board have higher degrees than do the Opal board members. While the education of the Opal members ranges from high school graduate with some noncollege training to those with bachelor's degrees, the Diamond members all have attended college with many having BA, MA and one, an honorary doctorate.

The previous superintendents also were similar in some respects and different in others. Both were white males between 40 and 50 years old, who had previous teaching experience, had served as assistant superintendents in their respective districts, and had under six years of experience in their current position. Although both superintendents ranked the "educational program" as their first priority and spent 20 to 30 percent of their time in that area, the Diamond County superintendent was more active in professional education associations and had more direct contact with a local college school of education than did the Opal superintendent. The superintendent also confirmed the perceptions of the school board that citizen interest in the schools was much higher in Diamond County than in Opal County. Moreover, according to the superintendent, teacher interest in school board activities was very high in Diamond County and moderately low in Opal.

Both superintendents repeated that they could use more money and that the most controversial issue in the districts was teacher's unions. In addition, there was some pressure from local groups to stress certain

---

*The following school board and superintendent information is based on data gathered by an earlier study: Harmon Ziegler and M. Kent Jennings with G. Wayne Peak, *Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts*, North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, 1974. The interviews for the Ziegler-Jennings study were conducted in 1969.

topics in the curriculum. In Diamond County that pressure emanated mostly from black groups who wanted more black history and culture in the curriculum. In Opal County, medical and business groups pressed for more emphasis on drug education and safety, while the Diamond superintendent said that no group in his district lobbied to have teachers avoid certain topics. The Opal superintendent reported that some community groups wanted to ban sex education and the teaching of evolution. Both superintendents, however, believed that there were some topics that high school students were not mature enough to study and that teachers were not knowledgeable enough to teach.

The two superintendents did, on the other hand, hold divergent opinions in several areas. The Diamond superintendent, for example, believed that there was too much centralized control (federal and state) over education and not enough local power. By contrast, the Opal superintendent was generally satisfied with the level of local control. Their attitudes toward several national education groups were also different. While the Diamond County school leader reported "slightly warm" and "fairly favorable" feelings toward the National Education Association (NEA) and the federal office of education, the Opal superintendent said his feelings were "quite cold and unfavorable." Also, although both were negative towards the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), the Opal superintendent rated his feelings as "very cold and unfavorable" (the most extreme negative response offered) and the Diamond superintendent said his attitude was only "a bit" unfavorable. The Opal superintendent, however, was very warm and favorable to local taxpayer groups while the Diamond superintendent was "a bit" cold and unfavorable.

The two superintendents expressed generally similar attitudes toward teachers' freedom to engage in a variety of controversial activities. Both superintendents agreed that teachers should feel free to join a union (this despite their obvious negative attitude toward unions); be a local party precinct worker; publicly criticize local government officials; belong to the NAACP or CORE; speak favorably about the United Nations in class; and allow the distribution of anti-communist literature in the classroom. Both school leaders

also agreed that teachers should *not* feel free to engage in a strike or to speak favorably about socialism in class. Several differences were also revealed. The Diamond superintendent believed that teachers should feel free to run for political office while his Opal counterpart did not. But, the Opal superintendent felt that teachers should feel free to "speak in class for or against the civil rights movement" while the Diamond superintendent did not. Finally, while the Diamond superintendent was undecided about allowing a teacher to have an atheist address the class, the Opal superintendent was definitely against it.

A final area of attitudinal difference was in giving teachers more voice in school decision making. In contrast to their respective school board views, the Diamond superintendent said that teachers should not have more voice (they had enough already), while the Opal superintendent believed that they should have more voice. The superintendents' responses to another question might help explain those attitudes. When asked, "Have the teachers in this district demanded a greater voice in determining school policies?," the Diamond superintendent responded "Yes," Opal, "No."

In relation to the educational program, both superintendents indicated that they could convince their respective boards to agree to a change if they themselves believed it was best. They also said that administrators usually initiated changes, but that teachers could and did have much input into the development of the educational program. Different procedures for providing that input were, however, described. According to the superintendent in Opal County individual teachers usually went to the board or an administrator. In Diamond County special teacher committees existed to facilitate that input.

Both districts had a large centralized administration with a superintendent, several assistant superintendents (including one for curriculum and instruction), and one social studies supervisor or consultant for the entire district. The social studies supervisor of Opal County was a white female in her 50s with a long history of teaching in the district. The social studies specialist of Diamond County was a white male in his 40s who relatively new (last two to three years) to the district. Both supervisors were responsible for over 100

secondary social studies teachers. Both viewed their role as one of supporting teacher efforts and providing information on new materials and workshops. Neither acted as an active aggressive initiator or facilitator of change.

The social studies teachers of both districts also had much in common. They were predominately white and male. The average number of years teaching experience was seven for both districts. The average number of years in the present system was five for both districts. About 75 percent of both the Diamond and Opal social studies teachers had tenure. Their average salary was between $10,000 and $11,000. Fifty-five percent of both social studies faculties had BA degrees or beyond and about 42 percent had MA degrees or beyond. The teachers of both counties averaged between one and two professional organization memberships and one and two professional journals read.

The statistical and observational data indicate that the level of social studies innovation in both districts was slightly but not greatly different. Diamond County was selected because it was clearly rated to be an innovative district. Opal was chosen because it was clearly a noninnovative district. From our data that difference does not seem very clear or substantial. Although Diamond was more innovative in a number of ways, it was really not extremely innovative.

The most obvious, but also most superficial, difference was the structure and organization of the social studies curricula in the two districts. For the past several years, the Diamond County program has been organized into quinmester (nine-week) minicourses. The district office provides outlines and materials suggestions for each course and lists nearly 80 such minicourses. Opal operates under the traditional semester plan with fewer choices and more traditional titles such as American history, government, geography, sociology, and psychology. Opal plans to change to the quinmester plan next year (1976).

Thus, because Diamond had a quinmester plan and offered a wide variety of courses, it was the "innovator" or "early adopter" while Opal was in the "late majority" or "laggard" category. The actual content and methodology of the social studies curriculum and instruction in both districts were not that different however. Both were

mostly traditional. Observational data supporting this conclusion includes: use of same or similar texts, predominance of teacher-directed instruction, and focus on facts rather than processes and reasoning.

The statistical measures of innovation also support this view. As the following chart shows, there is little practical difference between the two districts on awareness of social studies project materials, teacher participation in decision making, student involvement in classroom decision making, and teacher use of innovative practices.

Table 12

Results of Diamond and Opal Counties on Social Studies Teachers Questionnaire, Items 22-26*

22. To what extent are teachers in your school encouraged by administors to participate in decision making related to each of the following areas:

	Diamond	Opal
Curriculum program changes	1.47	1.59
Selection of curriculum material	2.03	1.73
Practices related to student attendance and student discipline	1.46	1.23
Hiring new teachers	.24	.20
Hiring new administrators	.00	.00
Budget decisions	.25	.47
Average:	.89	.85

*All of these scores are raw scores, not recoded. 0 = minimum, 4.0 = maximum.

23. How often do you participate in making decisions in each of the following areas:

	Diamond	Opal
Curriculum program changes	1.40	1.25
Selection of curriculum material	1.56	1.20
Practices related to student attendance and student discipline	1.05	.75
Hiring new teachers	.15	.11
Hiring new administrators	.00	.00
Budget decisions	.16	.39
Average:	.69	.59

24. To what extent are provisions made in your school for formal student involvement in making decisions about:

Dress codes	1.51	1.41
Other school behavior standards	1.48	1.33
Evaluation of teachers	.72	.66
Curriculum decisions	1.04	.82
Average:	1.17	1.04

25. To what extent are provisions made in your classroom for formal student involvement in the following areas:

Choosing learning activities	1.41	1.60
Choosing course content	1.17	1.25
Evaluating other students' work	1.01	1.03
Evaluating their own work	1.91	1.63
Classroom management	1.39	1.29
Evaluating you as a teacher	1.55	1.43
Average:	1.38	1.34

26. Indicate on the following scale the extent to which . . . your district [is] engaged in the educational activities listed below. Please check the appropriate open square.

	Diamond	Opal
Use of nontraditional grading systems	1.18	.97
Formulation and use of behavioral objectives	2.40	2.38
Combating sexism and racism in the school	2.45	2.20
Use of computer assisted instruction	.50	.62
Use of inquiry or discovery teaching methods	2.36	2.03
Use of individualized instruction	1.89	1.58
Use of community-based learning activities	1.77	1.59
Use of instructional television	1.17	.61
Use of student feedback to make changes	2.34	1.96
Participation in human relations training for teachers	1.40	1.04
Participation in team teaching	1.63	.60
Use of values clarification techniques	2.00	1.76

Table 13

Summary of Results of Social Studies Teacher Questionnaire, Items #22-#26: Diamond and Opal Counties

	Diamond	Opal
Awareness	.73	.46
Teacher decision making	.69	.59
Student involvement	1.38	1.34
Innovative practices	1.32	1.13

The social studies teachers' ratings of the responsiveness to change of various elements (principal, superintendent, etc.) in their respective districts also produced similar results. On a four point scale (0 - 3), each rated their superintendent as responsive a little more than slightly and their principals and curriculum administrators

as responsive to some extent. The most substantial difference was in the self-ratings of the social studies teachers. Diamond teachers saw themselves as responsive to some or a large extent; the Opal social studies teachers rated themselves as responsive to some or less than some extent.

Table 14

Results of Social Studies Teacher Questionnaire, Item #39; Diamond and Opal Counties

Responsiveness of	Diamond	Opal
Superintendent	1.42	1.19
Principal	1.83	2.00
Curriculum administrator	1.83	2.00
Social studies department	2.38	1.93

Most of the other aspects of the district did not produce substantially different mean scores between Opal and Diamond counties. The average age, for instance, of Diamond social studies teachers was 33 years as compared to Opal's 37. The distributions, however, revealed some interesting and potentially relevant differences. While one-fourth only (20 out of 78) of the social studies teachers in Opal County were female, nearly one-third (29 out of 91) of the social studies teachers in Diamond County were female. Also, 80 percent (73) of the Diamond teachers had either history or social science academic majors as compared to 68 percent (53) of the Opal teachers. About one-half of the Diamond teachers had over ten hours of inservice training related to teaching social studies, while about one-third of the Opal teachers had such training. Likewise 40 percent of the Diamond teachers had over nine hours of college courses related to social studies in the last three years as compared to only 27 percent of the Opal teachers. Finally, over one-fifth of the Diamond teachers read four or more journals, while only about one-tenth of the Opal teachers did. The Opal teachers, however attended nearly twice as many professional meetings (4.77 to 2.50).

When comparing social studies teachers of three schools that were visited in each district, the following distribution of high-index

teachers resulted.

Table 15

Comparison of Diamond and Opal High-Index Teachers on Four Innovation Indices

High-Index Teachers on	Diamond	Opal
Awareness	12	4
Teacher decision making	14	12
Student involvement	12	10
Innovative practices	21	13

There were clearly more aware teachers and users of innovative practices among the Diamond social studies teachers than among the Opal teachers. The number was about equal concerning teacher participation in decision making and student involvement in classroom decisions.

Thus, it appears that whatever differences were detected in the level of innovativeness of teachers, social studies departments, and schools wash out at the school-district level. Apparently the range of innovativeness in a district for social studies departments is wide enough so that, within a district, there are both innovative and non-innovative departments--at least in the two large districts studied. Except on a superficial structural level, the central administrations of Diamond and Opal did not exert direct influence on and initiate policies for all the high schools in the districts. Thus, the social studies departments tended to evolve on their own policies and practices. That evolution produced a range of innovativeness in both districts, which has apparently led to little distinction between the districts in overall level of innovation.

Chapter Five

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study has attempted to examine innovativeness at the teacher, social studies department, high school, and district level. A small sample of five districts and ten schools was used. Despite efforts to identify extremes of innovation and noninnovation, this sample did not provide a wide range of educational innovativeness at any level.

The study did, however, distinguish about 30 to 40 innovative teachers (according to our criteria) out of the 206 in the sample. Further analyses would have to be done to confirm that the same 30 teachers scored high on the different indicators of innovation: awareness of project materials, use of various general educational practices, participation in school decision making, and involvement of students in classroom decision making. The first three of those indicators detected that at least two-thirds of the innovative teachers were in the innovative schools as identified by both statistical and observational data. The first two indicators--awareness and use of innovative practices--were highly associated with each other and were considered the major indicators of innovation.

The ability to distinguish innovators and noninnovators at the social studies department level became more difficult, however, especially in the large urban/suburban districts.

This was probably because the limited range between innovation and noninnovation was even more apparent at the school and department levels. Still, there was remarkable congruence between the statistical indicators and the observations of the visitors in terms of identifying the most and least innovative departments and schools within that limited range.

Within this limited range, our data were unable to distinguish innovative and noninnovative districts, except at the most superficial level--course structure. (Since the small high schools were also

districts, this statement refers only to the two large districts in the sample.) This fact might be partly due to the ability of each of the social studies supervisors in the two districts to choose a sample of six high school social studies departments that did represent the range of innovation and noninnovation in the district.

Thus, the attempt to identify factors that related to innovativeness and noninnovativeness had to be focused on the teacher and social studies department levels. Several teacher and department variables were identified as having strong relationships with the two major indices of innovation. Tenure, current position, and highest academic degree appeared to be related to teacher awareness of the social studies project materials. Chairpersons, tenured teachers, and teachers with master's degrees or beyond were much more likely to be aware of those materials than their counterparts. In addition, although strong relationships did not appear, certain levels on other variables were clearly associated with awareness. Teachers who were over 40 years old, who had 20 or more hours of recent inservice training, who belonged to three or more professional organizations, who read four or more journals, and who taught six or more courses were much more likely to be aware of the project materials than those who had less.

Number of professional memberships and college courses related to teaching social studies associated most strongly with teacher use of various innovative practices. Again, teachers at maximum level (nine or more credit hours and three or more memberships) were most likely to use innovative practices. There was also a slight tendency for readers of five or more professional journals to use these practices more. Another slight relationship was that nontenured teachers tended to use innovative practices more than tenured teachers. Although not strong, this finding is the opposite of that found for teacher awareness.

The relationship between the numbers of professional journals read and innovativeness was also evident at the social studies department level. The more innovative department (Douglas) had more teachers who read four or more journals than the noninnovative department of Clouds.

Two other clear differences between the innovative and noninnovative departments were not related to teacher innovativeness--age and

teaching experience. The more innovative department had younger teachers with less experience. The relationship between tenure and innovation, which revealed opposite associations on two measures of teacher innovativeness, was confused further by the school results. The noninnovative department had more tenured teachers than the innovative department, which is consistent with its relationship to the use of innovative practices but not to awareness of materials.

No relationship between academic degrees and teacher innovativeness was revealed at the school level. The noninnovative department had nearly twice the percentage of teachers with master's degrees or beyond than the innovative department. The other factors that were related to teacher innovativeness were not revealed in the school comparisons.

Finally, the only conclusion to be reached from the district-level analysis is that differences between large districts on level of innovative activity are difficult to detect.

The instruments used in this study did, however, consistently reveal slight differences between the two large districts. Diamond nearly always scored slightly to somewhat higher than Opal on the measures of innovation. This could mean that the instruments are sensitive enough to detect even slight differences. This might indicate that the questionnaires are valid tools for research into educational innovation. Administering the questionnaires to districts more innovative than Diamond would further test the validity of those instruments.

Aside from this activity, various refinements and further analyses could be done with the original data. For instance, it could be determined whether the same teachers were high scorers on all of the four indices of innovation and also, whether the teachers in the high-index group were members of social studies departments with high-index chairpersons. Reading a certain number of professional journals and belonging to a certain number of professional organizations were both related to some of the measures of innovation. One might determine which journals and organizations were most closely related to social studies innovation and why this activity makes teacher innovation

more likely. One might also ask, Are new ideas found specifically in those activities or is engaging in those activities merely characteristic of teachers who tend to be more innovative? Finally, one could explore the effect of inservice training and college courses on classroom practices. Do these activities really lead to new classroom practices? If so, which type of training is most directly related to improving teaching and learning in the social studies?

In addition to exploring the major findings of this study and reworking the original data, a number of other interesting results would be worthwhile foci of future research in social studies innovation. A very high percentage of black teachers said they involved their students in classroom decision making. This finding should be tested with a larger sample of black teachers and, then, if confirmed, the reasons behind this trend should be explored.

Another finding was that only three-fourths of the social studies teachers in our sample taught social studies 75 percent or more of the time. How typical is this phenomena? What are usually the other duties--physical education, English, music? Does this mean social studies is the "dumping ground" for teachers who cannot teach other academic subjects? If so, why? And what are the consequences for a school in which this practice is widespread? These would be very interesting and relevant questions to research.

Nearly one-fourth of the sample of social studies teachers said they did not use any commercially published curriculum materials. If this was not a misinterpretation of terminology (which should be determined), then is this situation typical of social studies teachers across the nation? If so, why? What materials do they use--newspapers, magazines, bits and pieces of other books? Is this a sign of innovation or ignorance? What effect does this practice have on students' learning as compared to classrooms in which published materials are used?

Another interesting finding, and one that hindered the efforts of this study, was that few teachers are using the new social studies project materials frequently or extensively. This was the case in both innovative and noninnovative social studies departments. From the on-

site interviews, we discovered that some teachers had used and discarded them. Most, however, never used them. We know from this study that even teacher awareness of the materials is low.* The Carnegie-Mellon/Holt Social Studies Curriculum materials and the Harvard/Xerox Public Issues Series booklets were the most widely recognized. Further questions to explore would be: Is this non-use of the project materials true nationwide? If so, why? Are other materials now considered the innovative ones? If so, which ones?

In conclusion, this study has attempted to examine social studies innovation at the high school level and the factors that relate to its presence or absence. Although no definite results were produced for teacher, department, or district level innovation, a number of interesting findings merit future study. There were also some other positive by-products of this research effort. An instrument that could detect even slight variations in innovation was developed, used, and partially validated. Moreover, unlike many other studies, innovation was defined not merely as existence of a few so-called innovative practices but also as awareness of new materials and participation in decision making. Although this may still not be the most accurate index of innovation, it is an improvement over existing measures for studying innovation in social studies. This alone should improve efforts to examine the factors that inhibit or foster innovation in social studies.

This research study was conceived and initiated with the hope that one could identify specific factors that lead to social studies innovation. One of the forces that prevented us from producing conclusive results was the inability to uncover any social studies

---

* A recent publication of the Social Science Education Consortium perhaps qualifies that conclusion. Hahn, Carole L., et al. *Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1977. Although far from conclusive, there is some evidence in those three studies that teachers are aware of the project materials within these major subject areas.

departments and many teachers that were truly innovative according to our measures. This situation was partly due to weaknesses in the design and chance factors. From discussions with many educators throughout the nation, another explanation also seems plausible. Perhaps very few truly innovative social studies departments exist. That is, there may be very few social studies departments whose members are aware of a wide range of materials and resources; use a variety of new, exciting teaching strategies and learning activities; focus on major concepts, skills, and valuing processes; participate in making important school decisions; and involve students in the significant decisions related to teaching and learning in social studies. If this is so, then a crucial research study for prospective funders and publishers of curriculum development projects to undertake would be one that focused on the question, Why?

REFERENCES

Bamberger, Richard E. "A Study of Organizational Climate, Faculty Belief Systems, and Their Relation to the Rate of Adoption of Educational Innovations in Selected School Districts." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1970. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 31: 2629, November 1970.)

Carlson, Richard O. *Adoption of Educational Innovations*. Eugene, OR: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

Center for Educational Studies, Washington University. *An Evaluation of a Project for the Analysis, Development, Implementation, and Diffusion of the New Social Studies Curricula*. St. Louis, MO: Center for Educational Studies, Washington University, 1970. ED 054 996.

Chesler, Mark A. "Social Structure and Innovation in Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan, 1966. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 28: 293-94, July 1967.)

Crandall, David P. "The Relationship between Innovativeness and Selected Elements of Group Structure." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1971. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 32: 1774, October 1971.)

Dick, James S. "A Study to Determine the Characteristics of Innovative Social Studies Departments in the Secondary Schools of Indiana." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1974. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 35: 5674, March 1975.)

Evans, Richard I. and Peter K. Leppman. *Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education: A Social-Psychological Exploration Focused on Television and the Establishment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Frohman, Mark A., and Ronald G. Havelock. "The Organizational Context of Dissemination and Utilization." In *Planning for Innovation Through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge*, edited by Ronald G. Havelock, Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969, pp. 6-1 through 6-40.

Gill, Donald G. "The Relationship of Innovation and Complexity in Public School Systems." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois, 1969. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 30: 2753, January 1970.)

Gross, Neal, et al. *Implementing Organizational Innovations: A Sociological Analysis of Planned Educational Change*. New York, NY: Harper and Row, 1971.

Gulesian, Mark G. "A Study of the Age and Selected Sources of Information of Innovative and Laggard Educators." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts, 1970. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 31: 2005, November 1970.)

Havelock, Ronald G. *Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1971 (2nd Printing).

Hawkins, Wilber D. "Some Factors Which Contribute to Successful Educational Innovation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Los Angeles, CA: University of Southern California, 1968. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 28: 4410-11, May 1968.)

Hilfiker, Leo. "Factors Relating to Innovation of School Systems." *Journal of Educational Research*, 64 (September 1970), pp. 23-27.

Hillman, Larry W. "Organizational Climate, Leadership Characteristics, and Innovation in Selected High Schools of Ohio: A Study of Relationships." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Oxford, OH: Miami University, 1969. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 31: 3816, February 1971.)

Jwaideh, Alice and Gerald W. Marker. *Bringing About Change in Social Studies Education*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1973.

King, Alan. *Innovative Secondary Schools.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972.

King, Alan and Reginald A. Ripton. *The School in Transition: A Profile of a Secondary School Undergoing Innovation.* Toronto, Ontario, Canada: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1970.

Kohl, John W. "Adoption, Adoption Stages and Perceptions of the Characteristics of Innovations." *California Journal of Educational Research,* 20 (May 1969), pp. 120-131.

Leas, Albert. "A Study to Determine the Characteristics of Innovative and Traditional Educators." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1966. (Quoted in Smith, Frederick R. and C. Benjamin Cox. *New Strategies and Curriculum in Social Studies.* Chicago, IL: Rand McNally, 1969, pp. 154-55.)

Marcum, Reigo L. "Organizational Climate and the Adoption of Educational Innovations." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Logan, UT: Utah State University, 1968. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 29: 2932-33, March 1969.)

Marker, Gerald W. and Howard D. Mehlinger. *Report on the Social Studies Field Agent Training Program: Final Report.* Bloomington, IN: Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University, 1972. ED 076 463.

Matula, Franklin V. *Factors Contributing to the Willingness of Elementary Teachers to Try Selected Classroom Innovations.* Waco, TX: Educational Service Center, Region XII, 1972. ED 066 404.

McClimans, Dorothy F. "Teacher Innovativeness." Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin, 1967. (Abstracted in *Dissertation Abstracts* 28: 2952-53, January 1968.)

Miles, Matthew B. "Innovation in Education: Some Generalizations." In *Innovation in Education,* Matthew B. Miles, ed. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1964, pp. 631-32.

Miles, Matthew B. "Planned Change and Organizational Health." In *Change Processes in the Public Schools*, Richard O. Carlson, ed. Eugene OR: The Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965, pp. 11-34.

Mort, Paul R. "Studies in Educational Innovation for the Institute of Administrative Research: An Overview." In *Innovation in Education*, Matthew B. Miles, ed. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1964, pp. 317-39.

Mort, Paul R. and Francis G. Cornell. *American Schools in Transition*. New York, NY: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1941.

Myers, Charles B. *Social Studies Innovations, 1968-1969: A Report of the Social Studies Pilots of the Speedier Project*. Palymyra, PA: SPEEDIER Project, 1969. ED 040 899.

Richburg, James R. *Curriculum Diffusion: Dissemination and Adoption of Materials in the Anthropology Curriculum Project*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 1970. ED 045 529 (not available through ERIC).

Rogers, Everett M. "Lessons from the Diffusion of Agricultural Innovations." In *Perspectives on Diffusion*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1973, pp. 1-7.

Rogers, Everett M. *Diffusion on Innovations*. New York, NY: Free Press, 1962.

Rogers, Everett M., and F. Floyd Shoemaker. *Communication of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach*, 2d ed. New York, NY: Free Press, 1971.

Ross, Donald H. *Administration for Adaptability: A Source Book Drawing Together the Results of More Than 150 Individual Studies Related to the Question of Why and How Schools Improve*. New York, NY: Metropolitan School Study Council, 1958.

Smith, Louis. *Dilemmas in Educational Innovation: A Problem for Anthropology As Clinical Method*. New York, NY: Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, 1971. ED 048 643.

Smith, Louis M. and Pat M. Keith. *Anatomy of an Educational Innovation*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Zeigler, L. Harmon and Karl Johnson. "Educational Innovation and Politico-Economic Systems." *Education and Society*, 1 (February 1969), pp. 161-76.

Zeigler, L. Harmon and M. Kent Jennings with the assistance of G. Wayne Peak. *Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts*. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, 1974.